THE DEPENDENCE OF PART I OF CYNEWULF'S CHRIST *upon* THE ANTIPHONARY

BY

EDWARD BURGERT, O. S. B.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

PR1645
.B95

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1921

PR1645
.B95

THE DEPENDENCE OF
PART I OF CYNEWULF'S CHRIST
upon
THE ANTIPHONARY

BY
EDWARD BURGERT, O. S. B.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

WASHINGTON, D. C.
1921

Copyright, 1921
by
EDWARD BURGERT

J. D. Milans & Sons, Printers
Washington, D. C.

FOREWORD

The following dissertation, being restricted to a study of Part I of Cynewulf's *Christ,* will carry an especial interest only for students of Old English Literature. Yet the writer hopes that, in the main general content, its perusal may interest liturgiologists and lovers of our early native Christian Poetry to the extent, at least, of according a welcome to the first contribution of its kind from a student of Cynewulf so near to him in both Church tradition and station in life. If it were necessary to offer an explanation or even an apology for this hazardous venture by a beginner in Old English, and for his selection of a subject considered by many, even in our day of ripe scholarship, as unpractical and effete, the consideration indicated above would be amply sufficient.

Though the writer is deeply conscious of the imperfections in his work, he was determined to carry it out to the best of his ability, especially after he had received the encouragement of Professor Albert S. Cook, whose position as the foremost authority on *The Christ of Cynewulf* in this country, if not in the world, is universally accepted. Professor Cook wrote to him, in a letter of December 4, 1920, "I have long wondered that your Church, and especially your Order, should not have bestowed more attention upon Old English Literature. It is a hopeful sign that you are going into this matter so carefully."

Indeed, this field of our glorious Literature has been too long neglected by those whose heritage it principally is. Wherefore the writer entertains the hope that his modest beginning may break the way to a more intense study and a deeper appreciation of the Catholic Literature in Old England on the part of Catholic students in the English speaking world.

The indebtedness of the writer for the help and encouragement received on all sides is manifold. He wishes to express his gratitude to Dr. Karl Young of the University of Wisconsin, to Rev. F. G. Holweck, editor of the *Pastoral-Blatt* of St. Louis, and to Msgr. Henry, Litt. D., of the Catholic University of America, for various services rendered; but chiefly to Dr. Francis J. Hemelt, who not only gave him the inspiration for his work,

but assisted him at the cost of many personal sacrifices, and to Dr. P. J. Lennox, under whose patient and scholarly guidance the work was completed.

The text followed is that of Professor Cook in his edition of *The Christ of Cynewulf*, second impression, 1909. The additions that have accrued in the bibliography of *Christ I*, in as far as they bear upon the subject of the study presented, are noted in their proper places. The *Patrologia Latina*, edited by Migne, is quoted as P. L.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 7

II. The Sources as forming the Bases for the Divisions 15

1. The Divisions in *Christ I* 15

2. The Sources of the twelve Divisions 22

Division I 23

Division II 23

Division III 25

Division IV 25

Division V 26

Division VI 26

Division VII 27

Division VIII 29

Division IX 32

Division X 33

Division XI 43

Division XII 45

3. The Sources of the Lost Portion 48

III. The Sources as found in actual Church Use 53

1. General Observations 53

2. The Seven Universal O's 61

3. The Added or Monastic O's 66

4. The Remaining Sources 76

IV. Conclusion 81

1. The Dependence of *Christ I* upon the Antiphonary 81

2. Corollary "A": Further dependence upon the Antiphonary ... 86

3. Corollary "B": The Working Methods of Cynewulf and the Unity of the *Christ* 89

4. Corollary "C": The Sources of the *Christ* and the Poet 93

5. Conclusion 99

V. Bibliography 101

I

INTRODUCTION

The first part of Cynewulf's *Christ,* the *Advent,* or *Christ I,*[1] is contained in the 439 lines appearing in the beginning of the *Exeter Book.* This portion of the *Christ* had long been a puzzle to students, until, in his edition of 1900,[2] Professor Albert S. Cook solved the mystery surrounding the sources upon which it is based, and thus opened the way to a better understanding of this portion of the poem. For the knowledge, that *Christ I* is based chiefly on the Great Antiphons of Advent, called the *Advent O's,* aided in determining more precisely the character of the poem, in detecting more minutely the divisions in it, and, above all, in realizing more fully the spirit of deep religious fervor out of which it was born. As an aid in directing students and lovers of the *Christ* to a proper appreciation of all these phases of the poem, the scholarly edition of Professor Cook merits a distinction never before achieved in the presentation of an Old English text.

With all the diligent research and painstaking labor which Professor Cook has bestowed upon the study of the *Christ,* he is aware of the need of further investigation in the matter of certain problems still clamoring for a solution. That such problems exist, no serious student of Cynewulf will deny.

After a more detailed study of the *Christ,* and in particular of Part I, the conviction grew upon me that the attention given on the part of investigators to what appeared to me the true and full relation of *Christ I* to its sources was inadequate. For, with all the deeper and more accurate knowledge that we now have of Part I of the *Christ,* the belief apparently still prevails among scholars that this portion of the poem presents in its composition a more or less meaningless jumble of lyrical outbursts, illustrative of the *disjecta membra, rudis indigestaque moles* of Ovid. That the poet maintains no orderly treatment of the subjects within this section of the *Christ,* seems to be a foregone conclusion.

---

[1] This terminology, employed chiefly by European scholars, will be here adopted for the sake of brevity and convenience.

[2] *The Christ of Cynewulf,* edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by Albert S. Cook. Boston, 1900. The Albion Series.

The attitude thus taken towards the scheme or plan of *Christ I* is assumed to be the natural one, flowing from the very character of the poem and the nature of its sources. Perhaps this is partly the reason why so little attention was hitherto given to a detailed study of the larger construction in *Christ I.*

In defining the task which is here proposed as a step towards acquiring a better understanding of the relation which the smaller divisions of *Christ I,* until now but *disjecta membra,* bear to the sources upon which they are based, and to the plan of construction in the poem, the precise attitude of previous investigators towards this phase of *Christ I* must first be ascertained.

Cook,[3] in speaking of the faults of construction in the *Christ,* says:

> The fault of Cynewulf is in harmony with the tendency of the Old English poets in general, a tendency to dwell too much upon details, and neglect the architectonics, the perspective of the whole. The more intensely a poet feels, the greater is this danger, especially if a sufficient outline has not been provided for him by an author on whom he is dependent. Thus it is that the construction of Parts I and II of the *Christ* is better than that of Part III: the two together are not much longer than the third, and the originals selected were in each of those two cases sufficient to provide the framework of the division, while in Part III, notwithstanding the preponderance of the Latin Judgment Hymn as a source, much material, not greatly inferior in extent and interest, is drawn from other authors. It is true that Part I, being based upon a series of Antiphons, is essentially lyrical in character, and the only unity demanded is that secured through the character of the Advent season to which the Antiphons belong.

Cook grants to Parts I and II of the *Christ* a better form of construction than to Part III, inasmuch as the Latin originals for these two parts provided the poet with a *framework.* Yet, as affecting particularly Part I, this framework is evidently not considered as contributing anything definite towards a closer unity of construction in that part, for we are told that *the only unity demanded,* in this essentially lyrical part of the *Christ, is that secured through the character of the Advent season.* Thus Cook appears to have stated a problem without himself seeing the value of it. He admits the dependence of the poet upon a

[3] Pp. xc. f.

framework, but, at the same time, he does not expect the poem to derive any unity of construction from that dependence. He does not see beyond a *lyrical unity.*

Another student of the *Christ,* who has taken up the question of the construction in the poem, is George A. Smithson. In his study of the plot technique of the *Christ,*[4] he presents a more detailed investigation of the unity of the poem as a whole, as well as of the unity in each of its three parts. He there[5] undertakes to define more precisely the unity which should exist in the *Christ* as a whole, saying:

> In the *Christ* we may not look for the unity that lies in a single action with its beginning, its middle, and its end. Since the *Christ* is not narrative, since it does not arouse in us the feeling of suspense as to the event or outcome of the whole, we can look for the lyric unity alone. This is the unity of mood that is more easily felt than formulated. That the poem as a whole has this unity cannot be doubted. Its one predominating mood is the spirit of Advent, of the three-fold coming of Christ to men, through the Virgin birth, through the faith of the believer, and through the final judgment. That the general unity of the whole has not always been recognized, that the three main parts of the poem have been regarded as separate entities, can be due only to the fact that students have failed to recognize the existence or the force of that unity which is of mood alone.

Though the chief interest of the present study is confined to the unity seen in Part I of the *Christ,* this general characterization of the lyric unity in the poem as a whole cannot remain unchallenged, since its purpose is to strengthen the theory of lyric unity in each of the three parts, thus affecting also the larger construction of Part I.

I am not prepared to admit that there is a necessary unity of mood throughout the poem as a whole, based on the threefold coming of Christ to men, through the Virgin birth, the faith of the believer, and the final judgment. In the first place, the idea of a threefold coming of Christ was plainly foreign to the mind of Cynewulf. He nowhere expresses it; he nowhere seems to

[4] *The Old English Christian Epic.* A Study in the Plot Technique of the Juliana, the Elene, the Andreas, and the Christ, in comparison with the Beowulf and with the Latin Literature of the Middle Ages, by George Arnold Smithson. University of California, 1910.

[5] *Ibid.,* 325.

imply it. As the only proof for this unity, Smithson gives the words of St. Bernard:[6] *Triplicem enim ejus adventum novimus: ad homines, in homines, contra homines.* In passing, it might be noted that St. Bernard died A.D. 1153, at least three centuries after Cynewulf. Thus it is quite natural for students to fail to recognize the existence of a unity based on St. Bernard's words. When therefore Smithson says:[7]

> The division of the *Christ* into three main parts was probably due to the church's recognition of a three-fold advent of Christ,

his argument is inadequate.

It would be futile to question the recognition of a threefold advent in the mediæval Church. But, to all appearances, the idea of a threefold coming of Christ, as expressed by St. Bernard, was a development of the later Middle Ages when mysticism was in flower. It will be noted in this connection that St. Bernard represented the peak of that age of mysticism, being himself often referred to as the "mystic of the mystics." Though mystical interpretations, as affecting the liturgy of the Church, had been current at the time of Cynewulf, a specific instance in which this particular reference to a threefold coming of Christ can be found appears to be lacking. Cook, who so diligently searched for all possible references, is silent on the subject. He, indeed, quotes the words of St. Bernard above, yet only in illustration of the spirit of Advent. He does not apply them to the three main parts of the *Christ*.

In fact, the *Patrologia Latina,* edited by Migne, contains no record of an expression equivalent to that of St. Bernard before the eleventh century. In previous works of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers the interpretation of the coming of Christ to men was apparently restricted to the two advents expressed in the liturgy of the Advent season, the coming of the Son of God in the Incarnation, and His final coming at the Last Judgment. Thus Tertullian[8] of the third century, and Maximus[9] of the fifth century.

---

[6] *Third Advent Sermon,* Migne, P. L., 183, 45; cf. Smithson, 343; quoted also in Cook, xxvii f.

[7] *The Old English Christian Epic,* 342.

[8] See his *Liber Apologeticus adversus Gentes,* Migne, P. L., 1, 400; and his *Liber III. adversus Marcionem, ibid.,* 2, 329.

[9] See his *Homilia II.,* Migne, P. L., 57, 225.—Trautmann therefore

The thought of Christ's coming to the soul of the believer is naturally implied in the preparation for the feast of the Nativity which constitutes the special object of the Advent season. As such it is contained in the longings and expectations expressed so abundantly throughout the Advent liturgy, and in particular in the Greater Antiphons. As such it also appears in the lyrical paraphrases of *Christ I.* But this thought of the *spiritual advent* of Christ apparently found no outward expression, in the sense of St. Bernard's words, until a later time. Wherefore, the argument taken from the Church's recognition of a threefold advent, as affecting the division of the *Christ* into three main parts, appears decidedly defective.

In the second place, Part II of the *Christ* is simply not a *coming in faith to the believer,* however much we may strive to give it this interpretation. Cook is loath to call the second part a *coming* at all. He says [10] of the opinion which Dietrich held concerning this:

> * * * it verges on the absurd when he (Dietrich) declines to call the Ascension a departure from earth, or a return to heaven, and designates it as an arrival—a coming—into glory.

If the Ascension (Part II of the *Christ*), as treated by Cynewulf, represents a departure from earth, and not a coming into glory, it can much less be made to represent that phase of Christ's coming which St. Bernard designates as the *adventus in homines.* Indeed, the coming of Christ in faith to the believer can hardly be brought in connection with his departure from earth, and it would be extremely difficult to show that such a connection exists in the second part of the *Christ.* It thus appears that too much is being made of an argument not only invalidated by its anachronism, but also highly doubtful in its application to Part II of the *Christ.* If a lyric unity really prevails in the poem as a whole, it must be sought in a predominating mood other than the spirit of Advent as embodied in the threefold coming of Christ to men.

The unity of the *Christ,* despite Smithson's efforts to establish it securely, still constitutes a problem in Old English Literature. Although it is not within the purpose of my study to enter upon a full discussion of this unity in the *Christ,* a suggestion which

seemed to be right when he said that the threefold coming of Christ has not been found in any other author (before Cynewulf); cf. Cook, xix.

[10] P. xvii.

tends to throw some light upon the problem may be of service to future investigators.

Since the connection between Parts II and III of the *Christ* is more easily discernible than the connection between Parts I and II, the unity of the two latter is frequently called into question, some scholars even refusing to admit the authorship of Cynewulf in Part I. The relation, however, which the theme of Part I bears to the theme of Part II, may have been suggested to the poet by the lines of the fifth stanza of the well-known Advent hymn, *Veni, redemptor gentium.*[11] The lines in question are:

> Egressus ejus a Patre,
> Regressus ejus ad Patrem,
> Excursus usque ad inferos,
> Recursus ad sedem Dei.

An analysis of this stanza will show the parallelism between lines 1 and 3, and between lines 2 and 4, the two together being placed in opposition to each other:

> Egressus ejus a Patre—Excursus usque ad inferos,
> Regressus ejus ad Patrem—Recursus ad sedem Dei.

The parallel thoughts complement each other, in the first case by adding to the *terminus a quo,* "Egressus ejus a Patre," the *terminus ad quem,* "Excursus usque ad inferos"; in the second case by a mere synonymous expression.

Parts I and II of the *Christ,* in their general themes, bear out very strikingly the two thoughts contained in this stanza of the *Veni, redemptor gentium,* that is, the two extreme points in the temporal or human life of the Son of God, his Incarnation and his Ascension, his advent among men and his departure from them. What is more, the poet appears to develop the first thought in its completeness by laying a peculiar stress not only upon the *terminus a quo,* but also upon the *terminus ad quem* of Christ's advent. For the frequent recurrence, in *Christ I,* of the theme of Christ's coexistence with the Father ("egressus ejus a Patre") and the motive drawn from the harrowing of Hell ("excursus usque ad inferos") has been pointed out by all scholars dealing with the *Christ.*

The thoughts, then, expressed in the fifth stanza of this Advent hymn, would seem to furnish a more plausible basis for a unity *Christ* than the thought of Christ's advent *ad homines* and *in* of mood, or a lyric unity, in the first and second part of the *homines* can give. The theme of Part III of the *Christ* follows

[11] Duffield, *Latin Hymns,* p. 56.—cf. also, Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters,* i. 42; *The Hymner* (of the Sarum Breviary), p. 4.—This hymn is by St. Ambrose (died 397). In the *Leofric Collectar* it appears in the Matins of Advent, while the *Aberdeen Breviary* of 1508 assigns it to the Vigil of the Nativity.

naturally from that of Part II,[12] and thus the desired unity in the poem as a whole would not be destroyed. In *Christ I* Christ can be considered as beginning his work of Redemption, in *Christ II,* as completing the work and receiving his personal reward from the Father, while in *Christ III,* as demanding the fruits of the Redemption from the whole human race.

While Smithson is a firm believer in the lyric unity existing in the structure of the *Christ* as a whole (yet his argument was seen to be too weak for establishing this theory), he denies all unity within each of the three parts, though, in his opinion, the smaller divisions of the three parts themselves again show an excellent coherence within their own individual limits. In other words, the divisions within the three parts of the *Christ* are wanting in all unity among themselves, inasmuch as they show a distinct lack of coherence in their relation to one another. Speaking in particular of Part I, he says:[13]

> * * * the author of the *Christ* shows the ability to conceive the smaller scene as a whole with the proper relation of its parts. Now, when we turn to the larger scale, we see forthwith that he does not show the ability to view the smaller scenes as related parts of a larger whole. A cursory examination shows that Part I is a series of lyric outbursts thrown together at random. * * * The fourth division and the ninth are addressed directly to the Virgin Mary. Between them the fifth, sixth, and eighth are addressed to Christ, while the seventh is the colloquy of Joseph and Mary. The third addresses the Holy Jerusalem, and the eleventh the Trinity. Moreover, the divisions are not arranged as they have to do with the material coming of Christ or the spiritual. The first, fifth, eighth, and eleventh refer specially to the spiritual coming. Such arrangement could have been determined by nothing but chance.
>
> Part I, then, shows an absolute lack of the sense for larger coherence, of the restraint in the midst of lyric fervor which determines the structural plan of the whole.

From these words it is seen that the position taken by Cook in demanding of Part I of the *Christ* merely a "unity that is secured through the character of the Advent season," is carried by Smithson to its ultimate conclusion. If no other but a lyric unity, or unity of mood, is demanded, it must be because all other unity is lacking in the poem. Consequently there is no unity of construction, not even a sense for a larger coherence in Part I of the *Christ.* Smithson then goes on to show just in what manner the twelve divisions are "thrown together at random." Thus even the framework derived from the Latin originals, and admitted by Cook, vanishes completely from the plan of the poem.

[12] See especially lines 523-526.
[13] *The Old English Christian Epic,* 335 f.

And because no connection whatever is seen between the smaller divisions, it is plain that *such arrangement could have been determined by nothing but chance.* The lyric fervor of the poet alone determines the structural plan of the whole.

Fortunately for subsequent students of the *Christ,* the conclusions at which Smithson thus arrives are admittedly the result of a mere cursory examination of the contents and sources of Part I. A more detailed study of this particular question of structural unity in *Christ I* is therefore still needed, and it should not remain a fruitless endeavor. For, if the impression has gained general currency that the *Christ* is "essentially the work of a poet, though of a poet untrained in composition," [14] is this not principally due to an imperfect understanding of the influences which the sources themselves have had upon the arrangement of material in the poem? Have we ever seriously striven to acquire a better and more detailed knowledge of the *framework* which Cynewulf is supposed to have derived from his Latin originals?

It is true, the investigations devoted to problems in the *Christ* have been few and well scattered since the appearance of Cook's edition of that poem. The reason for this, no doubt, lies partly in the small number of students who devote their labors to the field of Old English Poetry, and partly in the specific liturgical research necessarily connected with problems affecting the contents of the *Christ.* Perhaps also the very completeness of Cook's edition of the *Christ,* and the copiousness of his Notes,[15] have caused the impression among students that whatever problems still lie unsolved in the *Christ* are of minor importance and, in as far as they can be solved, not worth the efforts of extended research.

If therefore an investigation of the structural plan of *Christ I* and of the arrangement of material therein is here undertaken, it is only from a conviction that the full relation of the poem to its sources has heretofore not been satisfactorily disclosed, and that these sources are unjustly held responsible for the apparent lack of a systematic treatment of the subjects chosen by the poet. A closer examination of the sources which form the bases for the individual paraphrases in *Christ I* as they are found in the actual Church use of the early Middle Ages will, I believe, reveal more fully their influence upon the succession of smaller divisions in the poem. And thus, I trust, will Cynewulf's dependence upon the Antiphonary appear in a clearer light, for it will be seen not merely as confining itself to the themes derived from that source-book, but as extending to the very plan of construction in Part I of the *Christ.*

[14] Stopford Brooke, *History of Early English Literature* (1892), 391.

[15] A further discussion of this will be found in the concluding chapter of this study, under Corollary "C."—see pp. 95 f. below.

II

THE SOURCES AS FORMING THE BASES FOR THE DIVISIONS

1. The Divisions in Christ I

Some divisions were always made in the text by editors and commentators of the *Christ,* but it was not until the sources of Part I were discovered by Cook that a proper distribution of the text of *Christ I* was achieved. Previous to that discovery, the evidences of division found in the manuscript itself [1] were mostly taken as the basis for an apportionment of the lines into various sections, though some scholars, in consequence of a better understanding of the poem, gradually saw the need of more accurate divisions.

Thus Wanley and Gollancz adhered strictly to the manuscript divisions, which mark off the following five sections in *Christ I:*

1. Lines 1-70.
2. Lines 71-163.
3. Lines 164-274.
4. Lines 275-377.
5. Lines 378-439.[2]

Thorpe and Dietrich added one division at line 416. Grein and Wülker increased them to eleven, making additional divisions at lines 50, 104, 130, 214, and 348. The discovery of the sources made necessary only one addition to the divisions accepted by Grein and Wülker, namely, at line 18. Thus we have the following twelve smaller divisions in *Christ I:*

(1) lines 1-17; (2) lines 18-49; (3) lines 50-70; (4) lines 71-103; (5) lines 104-129; (6) lines 130-163; (7) lines 164-213; (8) lines 214-274; (9) lines 275-347; (10) lines 348-377; (11) lines 378-415; (12) lines 416-439.

[1] The *Christ* of Cynewulf appears at the beginning of the *Codex Exoniensis,* or *Exeter Book,* which is accepted as dating from the early eleventh century, though our poem, from internal evidences of language and metre, is assigned to the end of the eighth, or beginning of the ninth century. For a complete description of the manuscript see Cook, pp. xiii-xvi.

[2] The division marks in the manuscript, as affecting *Christ I,* consist of a one-line space between the text, and additional signs, like :ɼ, or :—. This is the case in all the instances given here, except at line 275, where the space between this line and the preceding line has only the value of about a third of a line.—See Cook, pp. 70 f.

Each of these twelve divisions appears in the poem as a separate entity, and, except the first in which the beginning is lost, opens with the word *eala.*[3] These individual sections, moreover, are independent of each other in such a manner as to mark no progression of thought or development of plot. They are distinct and separate lays.

The sources upon which Cook found these independent portions of *Christ I* to be based are classified by him as follows:[4]

(a) The Greater Antiphons of Advent, sometimes called the O's;
(b) Four Antiphons included by certain mediæval churches among the Greater Antiphons, or associated with them;
(c) Two of the Antiphons for Lauds on Trinity Sunday (here counted as one) according to the Sarum Use.

The last section of *Christ I,* lines 416-439, was regarded by Cook as a sort of climax, or rather a resumptive dictated by what had preceded. It was his opinion[5] that "we shall hardly look for a specific source of these reflections" contained in the closing lines of Part I. In 1914, however, Professor Samuel Moore[6] completed the discovery of the sources by determining the basis even for this final section of *Christ I.* He observed that this last portion of the poem is based on the Antiphon *O admirabile commercium.*

The investigations of Cook, supplemented by those of Moore, have resulted in the following sources for the twelve smaller divisions of *Christ I:*

I Lines 1-17 : Based on *O Rex gentium*
II Lines 18-49 : Based on *O Clavis David*
III Lines 50-70 : Based on *O Hierusalem*
IV Lines 71-103: Based on *O Virgo virginum*
V Lines 104-129: Based on *O Oriens*
VI Lines 130-163: Based on *O Emmanuel*
VII Lines 164-213: .....The *Passus.*

[3] *Eala* is interpreted by Cook as an interjection equivalent to our "O," "Lo," "Alas"! It is thus apparent that the text of the manuscript itself gave a sufficiently noticeable clue for the proper divisions in the poem, which, no doubt, aided in directing Cook to the sources.
[4] P. 71.
[5] P. 113.
[6] In *Modern Language Notes,* xxix, 226 f.

VIII Lines 214-274: Based on *O Rex Pacifice*
IX Lines 275-347: Based on *O mundi Domina*
X Lines 348-377: Based on *O Radix Jesse* (perhaps?)
XI Lines 378-415: Based on two Trinity Antiphons
XII Lines 416-439: Based on *O admirabile commercium*

The knowledge of these sources necessarily gave a new aspect to the divisions in *Christ I,* for now it was evident that the twelve sections of the poem constituted so many separate portions treating a separate and definite theme. There was, moreover, a *reason* for making the divisions which, save one, Grein and Wülker had already recognized.

After a full knowledge of the proper divisions in the text of *Christ I* had been thus obtained, scholars apparently no longer paid any attention to the divisions marked in the manuscript itself. In this they were, I believe, quite unfortunate, for a comparison of the sections indicated in the *Exeter Book* with the divisions demanded by the sources will reveal to us a new beauty of the *Christ,* which at the same time points to a definite plan in the construction of the poem.

The one-line spaces in the manuscript form the following groups of smaller divisions or paraphrases:

1 O Rex gentium
I 2 O Clavis David
3 O Hierusalem
1 O Virgo virginum
II 2 O Oriens
3 O Emmanuel
– .....The Passus, or Dialogue
1 O Rex Pacifice
III 2 O mundi Domina
3 O Radix (?)
IV – The Doxology
– O admirable commercium [7]

It will be observed that the division marks in the manuscript do not interfere with the smaller divisions demanded by the sources, but, on the contrary, they give them a new and beautiful meaning. For, in the grouping of the O-paraphrases thus

[7] No account is here taken of the slight division mark, consisting of about a third-line space, at line 275.

obtained, we behold a symmetry of construction which strangely contradicts the theory of scholars that Cynewulf neglects the "architectonics," the "perspective" of his poem. If it can be safely assumed that the West-Saxon transcriber of the *Christ* followed the textual divisions originally contained in the poem, Cynewulf can be credited with a well-defined plan or outline in the composition of *Christ I.* For by discounting the *Passus,* which holds a unique position in the poem and is not based on a Greater Antiphon of Advent like the other divisions, and by dropping the last section based on the *O admirabile commercium* which is clearly a later appendage, the symmetry in *Christ I* is seen to be a perfect one. Each of the three groups contains but three O-paraphrases, followed at the end by an elaborate Doxology. It will also be observed that, of the three O's in each group, two are invariably addressed to Christ, while the third is directed either to the Blessed Virgin Mary, as in the case of groups II and III, or to the city of Jerusalem, as in the case of group I.

The appearance which *Christ I* thus presents suggests the structure of a Church hymn, especially since the poet has added to the O-stanzas a separate paraphrase in praise of the Holy Trinity not unlike the customary Doxology which terminates all hymns of the Church. Wherefore, though it would appear rash to attribute to the poem as such a strictly hymnic form in the details of its structure, the larger outline of *Christ I,* as seen here, seems to betray an intention on Cynewulf's part of following at least the broader structural plan of the usual Church hymn in the organization of the smaller members of his poetical composition.

The theory which would credit the poet with a hymnic plan of this kind when arranging the paraphrases within the poem, receives additional color from the very nature of the paraphrases themselves. For it is well known that the earliest impression which Part I had left upon the students of the *Christ* was that of its general hymnic character. Thus Wanley called *Christ I, Poema sive Hymnus de Nativitate D. N. I. C. et de B. V. Maria,* and designated the smaller divisions which he recognized as *Poema sive Hymnus.* In like manner was the poem labeled by Conybeare and Ettmüller.[8] In his brief characterization of Part

[8] Cf. Cook, 67 f.

I of the *Christ* Alois Brandl [9] says: *Christ I besteht aus Hymnen, Gebeten, und einem Dialog.* Stopford Brooke [10] speaks of *all the hymnic poems in this section,* and adds:

> Though I have used the word "epic" in regard to this poem, it is not an epic in any true sense of the word. It is more a series of hymns, at least at the beginning, closed by choric outbursts of praise.

These and similar accounts of the general character and content of *Christ I* have found their way into almost all handbooks of English Literature, and in the light of modern investigations dealing with the *Christ* of Cynewulf, the impression thus created cannot be entirely suppressed. It is true, in its original and restricted meaning of *laus Dei cum cantu,* the term "hymn" may not find a ready application to the poem of *Christ I,* for it is doubtful if the element of actual singing had ever entered the aim and purpose of its composition.[11] Yet, the later expansion of the term conforms more closely to the actual character and content of the poem.

In characterizing the sacred Hymns of the Church, Clemens Blume [12] writes:

> We have long understood by "hymnus" a song whose sequence of words is ruled by metre and rhythm, with or without rhyme, or, at least, by a symmetrical arrangement of the stanzas. * * * Hymn in the broader meaning of the word is a "spiritual song" or a "lyrical religious poem," consequently, hymnody is "religious lyric" in distinction from epic and didactic poetry and in contradistinction to profane lyric poetry.

[9] *Englische Literatur,* in Paul's *Grundriss,* II[1], 1035.

[10] *History of Early English Literature,* 390.

[11] Wülker, in his *Dramatische Bestrebungen der Angelsachsen* (Grundriss, 385), remarks that one might easily assume that these *hymns,* constituting Part I, were sung in church on certain festival occasions. The *Passus* or dialogue between Mary and Joseph, in particular, has been looked upon as being of a dramatic character with possible representation on the stage. This led scholars to view Division VII of our poem as the beginning of the English mystery play or drama. Yet, in our discussion below it will be noted to what extent just this *Passus* mars the hymnic outline which the poet may have had in mind in grouping the smaller divisions of the poem. For the opinions held by Conybeare, Wülker, Ebert, Gollancz, and Brooke concerning the dramatic character of the *Passus* see Cook, 96 f. Brooke (*History of Early English Literature,* 393) is even now disinclined to "give up the idea that these hymns were sung in parts in the church."

[12] "Hymns," in *Catholic Encyclopædia,* vii, 595.

It can hardly be denied that *Christ I* as a whole partakes of these characteristics of sacred hymnody. It will be readily granted that it is a "lyrical religious poem," that it is neither epic nor, to any great extent, didactic poetry. Furthermore, as seen in the present discussion, the manuscript divisions mark off the smaller portions of the poem into what appears "a symmetrical arrangement of the stanzas," each "stanza" in this case consisting of three O-paraphrases. In its broader application, therefore, the term *hymn* aptly characterizes the poem of *Christ I.*

The general hymnic character of the poem as a whole and of the individual paraphrases in it (for they are songs of praise, though not necessarily "cum cantu") lends support to the theory that Cynewulf had the structural plan of a Church hymn in mind when grouping the smaller divisions in *Christ I.* It may be possible that, even in his own day, Cynewulf found a precedent for such a poetical hymn in the "rhythmical offices" of the Church. In this connection it might be observed that the Antiphonary of Hartker, the earliest known codex containing all the O-Antiphons employed by Cynewulf, has such rhythmical offices. These are offices in which not only the hymns but all that is sung, with the exception of the psalms and lessons, are composed in measured language. An office of this kind in the Antiphonary of Hartker is that for the feast *De VI milibus Virginum,*[13] in which all Antiphons and Responses are in metre and often in rime. Perhaps Cynewulf had in mind these metrical Antiphons of the "rhythmical offices" when he himself paraphrased in poetry the Greater Antiphons of Advent.

Examples of Church hymns, in the stricter sense of the term, which are built upon the three-line stanza, are not wanting. Such, for instance, is the hymn *Pange lingua gloriosi praelium certaminis* of Venantius Fortunatus, or the seventh century hymn *Factor orbis angelorum.*[14]

Whatever the intentions of the poet may have been, *Christ I,* in its symmetrical grouping of the smaller divisions according to the manuscript evidence, does give the appearance of a hymnic composition. The structure of the poem, in this larger arrange-

[13] *Antiphonaire du Hartker,* in *Paléographie Musicale,* ser. II. i. 209-215. The editor, Dom Mocquereau, assigns it to the late tenth century. It is the St. Gall MS. 390-391, and is there reproduced in facsimile.

[14] Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters,* i. 131, 438.

ment of the paraphrases, gains thereby a closer unity which might appropriately be termed the "hymnic unity" of *Christ I.*

If the larger construction of *Christ I* is taken as presenting the appearance of a Church hymn, or, in other words, if the "hymnic unity" of the poem is accepted, a new light is thrown upon the *Passus* and upon the closing section of the poem. For, in this hymnic structure, neither the one nor the other can find a natural place. As regards the *Passus* in particular, it will be seen to differ from the other divisions in the poem in the nature of its material as well as in the treatment thereof. The material is not taken from the Greater Antiphons of Advent, and the construction of the whole division is unlike that of the other paraphrases. It is true, a different treatment is required by the very material which the *Passus* offers, yet this very fact of such an unaccustomed theme in the midst of the O-paraphrases would seem to confirm the theory that the whole division constituting the dialogue is by a later hand. Professor J. J. Conybeare, who was the first to note the dramatic character of the *Passus,* remarked in his Anglo-Saxon lectures at Oxford:[14a]

> It will be readily agreed that this subject, from its sacred and mysterious nature, is ill adapted to the purposes of poetry. The general absence of taste and refinement which characterized the age in which the poem was originally written, may fairly be pleaded in defense of its author. * * *

If the subject matter of the *Passus* is really ill adapted to the purposes of poetry, the theory that Cynewulf did not include it in the original draft of his poetical expansions of the Advent O's is again confirmed. As it stands in the poem transmitted to us in the West-Saxon eleventh century manuscript, the *Passus* certainly mars the symmetrical proportions otherwise maintained in the grouping of the smaller divisions of *Christ I.*

The last portion of the poem, lines 416-439, can be accepted as a later addition to the original plan of the poet even more easily than the *Passus.* It comes after the Doxology which should naturally form the conclusion of *Christ I.* It will furthermore be seen in the next chapter of this study that the source of this concluding division, the Antiphon *O admirible commercium,* is removed in the Divine Office of the Church by one week from

[14a] *Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (1826), 201.—edited by his brother, W. D. Conybeare, and quoted in Cook, 96.

the source of the last division preceding the Doxology. Yet, though from its peculiar position in the poem as such, as well as in the hymnic outline presented by the manuscript divisions, this portion of *Christ I* appears to be a later addition, the addition itself need not necessarily come from a later writer, because it is an addition and not, like the *Passus,* an insertion.

If we regard the *Passus* as an interpolation by a later writer, and the last division as at least a later addition by Cynewulf himself, *Christ I* appears in a new beauty which reflects the beauty of the Divine Office itself with its Hymns and rhythmical Antiphons. But above all, the poem as a whole receives a better form of construction than scholars have been inclined to grant. The charge that Cynewulf neglects the architectonics of his poetry can then hardly be directed to the poem of *Christ I* in its larger construction.

2. The Sources of the Twelve Divisions

The divisions made in the poem of *Christ I,* as manifested in the manuscript, were seen to have retained their significance even after a more detailed division of the text, as demanded by a knowledge of the sources, was reached. The groups of smaller divisions thus formed lend symmetry and a certain unity of construction, which I have called the *hymnic unity,* to the poem of the *Advent* as a whole.

Yet the relation of the smaller divisions as such to the larger outline of *Christ I* must still be ascertained. Wherefore it is necessary, in the following discussion, to disregard for the moment the possible influence of the manuscript divisions on the structural plan of Part I of the *Christ,* in order to avoid any confusion that may arise in connection with the successive order in which the individual paraphrases appear. The poet has been charged with having selected the sources and consequently the themes for his paraphrases with an absolute lack of the sense of coherence; he is said to have thrown them together at random. Thus, it will be said, even if *Christ I* presents the structural appearance of a Church hymn by the grouping together in the manuscript of the smaller divisions, the order in which these themselves stand in the poem is dependent upon nothing but chance.[15]

[15] See the quotation from Smithson, page 13 above.

The sources of the smaller divisions thus necessarily enter into our study of the unity of construction in *Christ I,* for they form the bases for the various sections of the poem, and it is upon their selection by the poet that the arrangement of material is dependent. Was their selection arbitrary? Or was the poet guided by an external influence in choosing the subjects for his successive paraphrases? The answer to these questions will determine whether or not *Christ I* presents a definite arrangement of material, and whence the poet derived the peculiar order in which this material appears in his poem.

In order to ascertain Cynewulf's method of selecting his sources, a closer examination of these sources as forming the bases for the twelve divisions in *Christ I* must first be made, for these have not been satisfactorily determined in each particular. From the table given on page 16 above it will be seen that in a few instances the source for the respective division of the poem is either unknown or doubtful. This applies especially to the *Passus* and to Division X. In other divisions the accepted source might be more definitely established, or the unity of theme more clearly determined. Where the basis for the division admits of no doubt, and the poet follows closely his source, there is no need of further investigation, since the interpolated matter in *Christ I* does not come within the scope of our study, unless it bears a vital relation to the sources themselves. These divisions, however, will be indicated in their regular order, so that a complete account of the sources as they appear in the poem may be had.

Division I: Lines 1-17[16]

is based on the Great Antiphon of Advent:

> O Rex Gentium et desideratus earum, lapisque angularis qui facis utraque unum: veni, et salva hominem quem de limo formasti.

Division II: Lines 18-49

is based on the Great Antiphon of Advent:

[16] The beginning of this division is lost, the manuscript of the *Christ* in the *Exeter Book* opening on folio 8[a] with the word *Cyninge,* "to the King."

O Clavis David, et sceptrum domus Israel; qui aperis, et nemo claudit; claudis, et nemo aperit: veni, et educ vinctum de domo carceris, sedentem in tenebris et umbra mortis.

The unity of this division might be questioned, since a great portion of it has no obvious relation to the Antiphon *O Clavis*. There are clearly two parts in this section of the poem: (a) lines 18-32; (b) lines 33-49. Of these only the first is based directly on the *O Clavis* Antiphon (much of the text is scarcely legible in the manuscript), while the second part develops a thought apparently foreign to the thought conveyed by the Antiphon. Still, lines 33-49 are connected to the preceding portion by the conjunction *forþon,* which shows that what follows is narrated in consequence of the thought development carried out in lines 18-32, or at least in the lines immediately preceding.

Smithson[17] makes the "mention of the saving power of the Lord" in the first part responsible for the thoughts developed in the second part, which is said to portray the *manner* of the saving. Yet, if we follow the reading proposed by Professor Bright in line 30,[18] the thought-connection between the two parts becomes clearer and appears less strained. He interprets the words

* * * *þ*e hē tō wuldre forlēt (line 30[b])

as meaning "whom he hath (denied) shut out from glory." The particular glory implied here seems to be that of *Paradise*.[19] Such an interpretation would agree with the lines immediately following,

*þ*ā wē hēanlīce hweorfan sceoldan
tō *þ*is enge lond, eðle bescyrede. (lines 31, 32)

The full import of the *claudis, et nemo aperit* is thus set forth in connection with the banishment of the human race from the Garden of Eden, which entailed the loss of the heavenly heritage and turned man as an exile into this *narrow land* of sufferings and trials. But upon this sentence of exile followed at once the

[17] *The Old English Christian Epic,* 334 f.
[18] See Cook, 78.
[19] In the Germanic languages the word *wuldor* refers to the glory of "heaven." It is possible that Cynewulf, for the lack of a suitable word for "paradise," employed it here in this sense. If, however, this interpretation of the word *wuldor* cannot be accepted, the "shutting out from the glory of heaven" could be regarded as being typefied by the expulsion from the Garden of Eden.

promise of the Redeemer as a result of the divine mercy,[20] wherefore the poet continues:

> For*þ*on secgan mæg sē *ðe* sōð spriceð
> *þ*æt hē āhredde, *þ*ā forhwyrfed wæs,
> frumcyn fīra. (lines 33-35ª)

Immediately there rises before the mind of the poet the picture of that wonderful woman mentioned to our first parents before the sentence pronounced over them and their offspring was carried out: that woman who was to crush the serpent's head and through whom the promised Redeemer was to come. Consequently, the remaining portion of this division describes Mary, the mother of the Savior.

Thus the two parts of Division II become one in the poetical completion of the theme suggested by the Antiphon, which glorifies the Key that closed eternal life to mankind after the transgression in Paradise, and again opened it in the Incarnation and subsequent Redemption.

Division III: Lines 50-70

is based on the Great Antiphon:

> O Hierusalem, civitas Dei summi: leva in circuitu oculos tuos, et vide Dominum tuum, quia jam veniet solvere te a vinculis.

In his paraphrase of this Antiphon the poet intermingles references to the city of Jerusalem in Palestine and to the heavenly Jerusalem.

Division IV: Lines 71-103

is based on the Great Antiphon:

> O Virgo virginum, quomodo fiet istud, quia nec primam similem visa es nec habere sequentem. Filiae Jerusalem, quid me admiramini? Divinum est mysterium hoc quod cernitis.

---

[20] Gen. iii. 15. The interpretation of this verse as carrying a promise of the Redeemer was universal in the ancient Church even as it is today.

As suggested by the Antiphon, the passage forms a dialogue between the daughters of Jerusalem and the Virgin Mary.[21]

Division V: Lines 104-129

is based on the Great Antiphon:

> O Oriens, splendor lucis æternae et sol justitiae: veni, et illumina sedentes in tenebris et umbra mortis.

After the address and petition based on the Antiphon, there follows an expository portion, lines 119-129, not based on the text of the Antiphon, but connected with it in thought in the following manner: what we have asked for in the petition, we now believe to have been granted.

Division VI: Lines 130-163

is based on the Great Antiphon:

> O Emmanuel, Rex et Legifer noster, expectatio gentium et salvator earum: veni ad salvandum nos, Domine Deus noster.

In the second half of this division, lines 148[b]-163, the motive drawn from the Harrowing of Hell is introduced by placing the petition of the Antiphon into the mouths of the just souls in Limbo. The poet arrives at this motive when, in line 145, in adherence to the common interpretation of his time, he extends the thought of *expectatio gentium* to the *grundas*, that is, to those yearning for deliverance from the prison of the Limbo. For the possible influence of the hymn *Veni, redemptor gentium* in *Christ I* see page 12 above.

[21] Cook remarks (p. 87) that line 90 "seems inappropriate to the context." Yet, upon closer examination this does not appear to be the case. Lines 78-85 paraphrase the *quia nec primam similem, visa es, nec habere sequentem* of the Antiphon. These words imply a comparison between the motherhood of Mary and that of the rest of womankind. Such a comparison is expressed in lines 85[b]-87[a]:

> * * * Swā eal manna bearn
> sorgum sāwað (conceive), swā eft rīpað (bear),—
> cennað tō cwealme. (lines 85[b]-87[a])

An example of the development of this thought can be found in the *Fragmentum De Partu Virginis* ascribed to St. Ildephonse; see Migne, P. L., 96, 230; cf. also Gen. iii. 16.

In her answer, the Virgin Mary alludes to this comparison made by the daughters of Salem, asking not only

> Hwæt is þēos wundrung þe gē wāfiað, (line 89)

but also

> ond gēomrende gehþum mænað,
> sunu Sōlimae somod his dohtor? (lines 90, 91)

The following lines then explain the mystery of the disparity in the motherhood of Mary and of those addressed.

Division VII: Lines 164-213

This section of *Christ I* constitutes what scholars call a *Passus*. It is a dialogue between the Virgin Mary and her spouse St. Joseph, and is not based on an Advent Antiphon. For its unique position in the poem, especially in the scheme or plan of *Christ I*, and for the theory of regarding these lines as a possible interpolation by some later author or scribe, see page 21 above.

No direct source for this passage has been discovered, and it is very probable that such a source will never be found. However, if Cynewulf is the originator of this dialogue between Mary and Joseph, he did have a source for the conception of it in the Gospel extract assigned to the Vigil of the Nativity, Matth. i. 18-21. The theme of this Gospel passage is reserved in the liturgy of the Church for the immediate preparation for the Birth of Christ, and not only do the Gospel and the Homilies read on the Vigil of Christmas treat of the predicament in which Joseph found himself with regard to his spotless spouse, but the Antiphonary echoes the same thoughts in the Office for that day.[22]

But, unlike the Gospel passage, in which an angel appears to Joseph for the purpose of allaying his fears and instructing him in the true mystery, Cynewulf allows the Virgin Mary herself to impart this revelation to her troubled spouse. The very form of the dialogue demands this treatment by the poet.

Cook did not determine any Latin original as the basis for this division of *Christ I*. In a later study,[23] however, he brings the whole passage containing the dialogue into relation with certain homiletical expansions, four of which are found in the Greek Fathers, and one in the Latin. These homilies are by (Pseudo-) Athanasius, (Pseudo-) Chrysostom, (Pseudo-) Proclus, Germanus, and (Pseudo-) Augustine, and contain dialogues similar in character and content to the dialogue presented by Cynewulf. In summing up the result of his study, Cook says:

[22] Thus, in the *Antiphonary of Hartker* (*Paleographie Musicale*, ser. II, i. 7), of the tenth century, one of the Antiphons for the Vigil of Christmas reads, *Cum esset desponsata mater iesu maria ioseph ante quam conuenirent inuenta est in utero habens, quod enim in ea natum est de spiritu sancto est.* Another Antiphon (p. 43) for the same day touches still closer the problem treated in our dialogue, *Ioseph fili dauid noli timere accipere mariam coniugem tuam, quod enim in ea natum est de spiritu sancto est.*

[23] "A Remote Analogue to the Miracle Play," in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iv. 421-451.

> The dialogue in Cynewulf's *Christ*, which had been looked upon as an early precursor of the miracle plays, is itself anticipated by dialogues composed by certain Greek Fathers as a homiletical feature, and are due to a tendency to Hellenize Jewish history which may antedate the time of Christ, and which is strongly marked as early as the fourth century of our era.

In a subsequent paper,[24] Cook proved that the dramatic tendency in question did exist in the fourth century. He finds invented addresses in a sermon of Ephraem Syrus (died 373), which he quotes in its Latin translation. Yet, because it seems doubtful whether or not Ephraem was acquainted with Greek, Cook is willing to modify his previous statement that "this method of animating a discourse by the introduction of dramatic elements is undoubtedly due to Hellenic influence."

Latin originals for this dialogue in *Christ I*, or other originals known early in a Latin translation, are thus seen to have existed at the time of Cynewulf. It would be difficult to assume that he proceeded to compose the *Passus* without any knowledge of one or more of these homilies, or at least of a source in which they were employed. Such a knowledge need not necessarily have been acquired by the poet outside the readings of the Divine Office, for the number of Lectionaries and Homiliaries preserved from the eighth and ninth centuries is too small to justify the inference that such homilies as discovered by Cook were not then in use.

Thus, for example, in the Homiliary of Paul the Deacon,[25] composed by order of Charlemange, two homilies are assigned to each Sunday and the Ember days of Advent, while the Christmas Office has as many as eleven. Of the twenty-eight homilies which the Carolingian Homiliary lists for the season of Advent including Christmas Day, only nine are still in use at the present time. No doubt, selections were made from this large number of excerpts from the Fathers, so that not all the homilies indicated were read on the respective days. The particular selection must necessarily have depended largely upon the books or codices in possession of the individual monastery or cathedral church at the time. For this same reason St. Benedict leaves the choice

[24] "A Dramatic Tendency in the Fathers," *ibid.*, v. 62-4.
[25] *Homiliarius Pauli Winfridi Diaconi*, in Migne, P. L., 95, 1160-69.

of the readings in the Divine Office to the discretion of the Abbot, though he has not neglected to lay down in minute details all particulars relating to the recitation of the Office. In his Rule [26] he determines the number of Lessons for each Nocturn, but he specifies no author in particular, saying:

> Let the divinely inspired books, both of the Old and New Testaments, be read at the Night-Office, and also the commentaries upon them written by the most renowned, orthodox, and Catholic Fathers.

These rich homiliaries of the early Church consequently afforded the monks and ecclesiastics of those days a wide range of patristic reading, so much so that we are astonished at their extensive knowledge of the various Church writers. The possibility is therefore not excluded that Cynewulf had a knowledge of one or all of the five homilies indicated by Cook, or that by his time a compilation of these had existed in some other sermon or writing of a later author, which itself could have furnished the poet with a source for the dialogue in Division VII of *Christ I.* If the whole *Passus* should be an interpolation of a later century or author, the question of a possible source in one or more of these homilies remains the same as in the case of Cynewulf's authorship, and the observations made here will find their application to any supposed writer of the dialogue in *Christ I.*

While the direct source for the *Passus* must still remain in doubt, it is plain from what has been said that the material therein contained is in essence the material reserved by the Church for the liturgical service of the Vigil of the Nativity. In the case of this division therefore we must, for the present, be content with the proper placing of the subject matter into its liturgical setting in the service of the Church. Whatever the source for Cynewulf's poetical expansion of this subject matter may have been, it is most likely that it likewise belonged to the celebration of the Vigil of Christmas.

Division VIII: Lines 214-274

is based on the Great Antiphon:

O Rex Pacifice, tu ante saecula nate: per auream egredere

[26] Chapter ix. ed. by Dom Oswald Hunter-Blair, 1906, p. 59.

portam, redemptos tuos visita, et eos illuc revoca unde ruerunt per culpam.

After the address which follows that of the Antiphon, the poet interpolates a lengthy expository development of the theme suggested by the words *tu ante saecula nate,* lines 224-243[a]. This portion introduces the story of the creation of light,[27] which is the first creative act of God mentioned in the Bible. By bringing the idea conveyed by the *tu ante saecula nate* into comparison with the first external creative work the poet emphasizes the coexistence of the Son with the Father from all eternity.

In a note to lines 239-240, Cook[28] thinks that these two lines may possibly have some reference to the Great Antiphon of Advent, *O Sapientia;* but he warns that the connection, if it exists, is very slight, and is suggested only by the existence of these Antiphons in one series. He adds: "It is just possible that the section based upon this Antiphon is in the part destroyed." Yet, in the list of sources attached to the beginning of his Notes,[29] Cook definitely assigns the Antiphon *O Sapientia* to the ninth place.

The lines of the *Christ* referred to are:

> þū eart sēo Snyttro þe þās sīdan gesceaft,
> mid þī Wāldende, worhtes ealle.

The Antiphon in question is:

> O Sapientia, quae ex ore altissimi prodiisti, attingens a fine usque ad finem, fortiter suaviterque disponens omnia: veni ad docendum nos viam prudentiae.

It must be admitted that there is a slight connection between the words of the *O Sapientia* and lines 239-240 of the *Christ.* But it would seem unfair to assume that Cynewulf intended these two lines as a reproduction of the Antiphon in question. The *O Sapientia* is the first of the series of Advent Antiphons known as the Great O's. The position it thus takes among the Greater Antiphons would seem to require a treatment more adequate and a position more prominent than lines 239-240 can give it. Furthermore, the fact that it is the first of the O-Antiphons creates a strong presumption in favor of its appearance in the lost portion

[27] Gen. i. 1-5.
[28] P. 101.
[29] P. 71; cf. pp. 72 f.

of the poem, that is, at the beginning of the *Christ*. Indeed, what Cook declares to be "just possible" seems to be demanded by the importance of the Antiphon. A further discussion of this will follow below.[30]

Lines 239-240, in their context, seem rather to be an epitomized recount of the passage in the Book of Proverbs,[31] in which the excellence of Wisdom is set forth. We note these salient passages:

> Dominus possedit me in initio viarum suarum, antequam quidquam faceret a principio. * * * Ab aeterno ordinata sum, et ex antiquis antequam terra fieret * * * quando appendebat fundamenta terrae cum eo eram cuncta componens.

This passage may in fact have suggested to the poet his story of the creation of light, in the words *antequam quidquam faceret* and *antequam terra fieret,* for, as has been observed, the creation of light was the beginning of the visible creation. Indeed, the poet seems to allude expressly to these words of Proverbs in line 238,

> ǣr *þ*on ōht *þ*isses ǣfre gewurde.

The phrase *cum eo eram cuncta componens* is reproduced almost verbally in lines 239-240:

> *þ*ū eart sēo Snyttro *þ*ē *þ*ās sīdan gesceaft,
> mid *þ*ī Wāldende, worhtes ealle.

The reference taken here from the Book of Proverbs has been made quite familiar by its frequent use in the Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and in this use it must have been so well known to Cynewulf as to suggest itself at once in the development of the theme connected with the eternal co-existence of the Son with the Father. Though it must be considered as only a subsidiary influence in this division of *Christ I,* it makes unnecessary our recourse to the Great Antiphon *O Sapientia* as a basis for lines 239-240. Thus the division based on the *O Rex Pacifice* does not appear to admit any other of the Greater Antiphons as a source for its lines.

---

[30] See pages 48 ff. below.
[31] Prov. viii. 22-31.

DIVISION IX: Lines 275-347

is based on the Great Antiphon:

> O mundi Domina, regio ex semine orta: ex tuo jam Christus processit alvo, tanquam sponsus de thalamo; hic jacet in praesepio qui et sidera regit.

Much of the Antiphon is not utilized by the poet in this section. In the opening lines of the division, lines 275-294ª, he dwells at length on the appellation *domina,* with additional thoughts on the title *sponsa* (in lines 280, 292) probably suggested by the Antiphon.

The middle portion of the Antiphon does not seem to be represented in this division of *Christ I,* except that it may have led the poet to insert his long exposition dealing with the Vision of the prophet Ezekiel in lines 301-334.

After this digression, however, he returns to the thoughts of the Antiphon in his final petition to the Virgin Mary, lines 335-347, when in answer to the request

> Iowa ūs nū *þ*ā āre *þ*e se engel *þ*ē,
> Godes spelboda, Gābriēl, brōhte.
> Hūru *þ*æs biddað burgsittende
> *þ*æt ðū *þ*ā frōfre folcum cyðe,
> *þ*īnre sylfre Sunu. (lines 335-339ª)

he announces joyfully that

> nū wē on *þ*æt bearn foran brēostum stariað, (line 431),

in agreement with the words of the Antiphon, *hic jacet in praesepio.*

In the concluding lines of the petition the poet asks for admission into the Father's kingdom—*in Fæder rīce*—which points to the last phrase of the Antiphon, *qui et sidera regit.*

In an article on *The Great Antiphons: Heralds of Christmas,*[32] Herbert Thurston remarks,

> I cannot help thinking that it (the Antiphon *O Gabriel*) has suggested in part the passage in the *Christ* about the wall and gate, lines 307, seq.

The Antiphon suggested by Thurston is the following:

> O Gabriel, nuntius coelorum, qui januis clausis ad me intrasti, et Verbum nuntiasti: Concipies et paries, Emmanuel vocabitur.

[32] In *The Month* (London), vol. 106, p. 620, note. (December, 1905.)

However, since the whole passage following line 307 unmistakably refers to the wonderful entrance beheld in miraculous vision by the prophet Ezekiel, it would rather seem to be connected with the phrase *per auream egredere portam* of the Antiphon *O Rex Pacifice*. In fact, when dealing with that Antiphon in the preceding division, the poet alludes to the "golden gate" in lines 251-253. But he reserves this subject for ampler treatment in the present division.

The Antiphon *O Gabriel* can hardly be interpreted as a reference to this vision of Ezekiel, for with no stretch of the imagination can the words *qui januis clausis ad me intrasti,* spoken of the angel Gabriel, be made to apply to the virginal birth of Christ and the perpetual virginity of His mother as implied in the "golden gate." The archangel Gabriel is twice mentioned in *Christ I,* in line 201, and in line 336. Both of these instances refer to the message brought by the archangel into the humble chamber of the Virgin in Nazareth, as described in the Antiphon *O Gabriel*. Wherefore these two lines might be brought in connection with the Antiphon *O Gabriel* more readily than lines 307 ff. of our division.

Still, as a basis for any section in *Christ I,* the *O Gabriel* Antiphon must drop out of consideration. With Cook [33] we may relegate this Antiphon to the lost portion of the *Christ*.

Division X: Lines 348-377.

No investigator has been able to ascertain with any degree of certainty the basis for this portion of *Christ I*. As a possible basis for the lines of this division Cook gives the Great Antiphon:

> O Radix Jesse, qui stas in signum populorum, super quem continebunt reges os suum, quem gentes deprecabuntur: veni ad liberandum nos, jam noli tardare.

Yet, he admits [34] that a great part of this section has no obvious relation to this Antiphon, explaining that there may be "contamination" with the next, as well as with some of the preceding portion.

Upon a close examination it will be seen that only two phrases of the Antiphon *O Radix* find an echo in lines 348-377, the *veni ad liberandum nos,* and the *jam noli tardare*. Of this and of the

[33] P. 73.
[34] Cook, p. 107.

exclusion of the *O Radix* Antiphon as a basis for this division, the following discussion will treat more fully.

In offering an emendation to Cook's theory, Alfred A. May [35] advances the belief that Cynewulf, in composing the passage constituting Division X, had in mind the Great Antiphon *O Sapientia,* but that he did not use the text of this Antiphon itself for the basis of his lines, being influenced by the passage in Ecclus. xxiv. 5, *primogenta ante omnem creaturam,* upon which the *O Sapientia* is partly based. In this opinion, Cynewulf took not the Antiphon but its Scriptural source as the basis for his poetic comment. Another argument for accepting the Antiphon *O Sapientia* as at least the indirect basis for this division, May finds in the two expressions *ne lata tō lange* of line 373 of the *Christ,* and *pæt þū ūs āhredde* of line 374. He explains in the following manner: [36]

> This passage (lines 372[b]-374[a]) resembles, as has already been mentioned, the *veni ad liberandum nos, jam, noli tardare,* which is the petition in *O Radix.* But at the head of the list of the Greater Antiphons in the Sarum Use (and hence immediately preceding *O Sapientia,* the first of the group), appears this versicle and response:
>
> *Festina, ne tardaveris, Domine: et libera populum tuum.*
> *Veni, domine, et noli tardare: relaxa facinora plebi tuae.*
>
> This versicle, the gloss states, is always sung before the antiphon ("ad initium hujus antiphonae"). The association in Cynewulf's mind of the versicle with *O Sapientia* is thus natural and almost inevitable; and the similarity between his words and the words of the versicle is quite evident.

Before we enter upon a discussion of this emendation presented by May, it may be said that, if his conclusions are accepted, they shed considerable light upon the lost portion of the poem. For, if Cynewulf had in mind the Antiphon *O Sapientia* but refused to employ it as the direct basis for this section of his poem, turning instead on the one hand to the Biblical source of the Antiphon itself, and on the other to the liturgical matter immediately preceding the O's in the Antiphonary, his procedure can be explained only by the fact that he had already made use of the *O Sapientia* in another portion of the poem. That portion, again,

[35] "A Source for *Christ,* ll, 348-377," in *Modern Language Notes,* xxiv. 158 f.
[36] *Ibid,* 159.

must be the one lost from the manuscript, for it was seen that lines 239-240 can hardly be accepted as forming the paraphrase of this Antiphon. Furthermore, granting that the *O Sapientia* stood at the beginning of *Christ I,* and that this last division preceding the Doxology is reminiscent of the same Antiphon, the whole of Part I of the *Christ* is knit more firmly together into one complete unit.

Still, the emendations thus offered to the theory of Cook seem to drive us from Scylla merely to Charybdis. For if much of Division X has no obvious relation to the Antiphon *O Radix,* the same must be said of its direct, and in a lesser degree of its indirect, relation to the *O Sapientia.* Thus we are not brought nearer to a probable source for the whole of Division X.

Indeed, the aptness of the emendations offered by May is doubtful. These refer to the two sections in Division X, to the address (lines 348-358[a]) and to the petition (lines 358[b]-377).

If the content of the address is compared with the suggestions made by May, his observations indeed carry some weight. For this portion does glorify the co-eternity of the Son with the Father, and might have been suggested by the words *primogenita ante omnem creaturam* (Ecclus. xxiv. 5). But to infer that Cynewulf looked at the text of the *O Sapientia* in the Antiphonary, in order to be reminded of the verse in Ecclesiasticus, is straining the situation just a little. While it may be futile to deny the poet an exact knowledge of the Biblical passage upon which the respective Antiphons were based,[37] no other instance in *Christ I* reveals a conscious turning on his part to these sources for poetic comment on the Antiphons themselves.

The suggestion of May in relation to the words *ne lata tō lange* and *þæt þū ūs āhredde* of the petition appears even less happy than his first emendation. For it is not necessary to turn to the versicle preceding the Greater Antiphons in the Antiphonary in order to find expressions equivalent to the words in the *Christ.* Such phrases, as contained in the versicle referred to, are of common occurrence in the Advent Office. They were also incorporated into the Antiphons. For instance, in the Antiphonary of

[37] Apparently the custom of indicating the Scriptural sources after the text of the O-Antiphons is of quite recent date. An example may be found in the Paris Breviary of 1736: cf. *Breviarium Parisiense,* anno 1736, pars hiemalis, p. 207 f.

Hartker,[38] one of the Antiphons used on the Monday of the last week in Advent is: *Convertere Domine aliquantulum et ne tardes venire ad servos tuos.* Another for the Tuesday of the last week is:[39] *Veni domine et noli tardare, relaxa facinora plebis tuae israhel.* In the same Antiphonary,[40] the Antiphon appended to the list of Great O's, and thus classed in importance with the Greater Antiphons themselves, is: *Qui venturus est veniet et non tardabit; jam non erit timor in finibus nostris.*

Likewise do we find the thought for *þæt þū ūs āhredde* in more than one of the Greater Antiphons themselves. Thus, apart from the *O Radix* which was considered as a possible basis for Division X, the *O Adonai* has the petition: *veni ad redimendum nos;* and the *O Emmanuel, veni ad salvandum nos.*

But if recourse must be had to the versicle preceding the Greater Antiphons in the Sarum Use for a connection of Division X with the Antiphon *O Sapientia,* the argument does not appear well chosen. For the statement of the "gloss" is, I fear, not rightly interpreted when the versicle and response are made to precede in actual Church use the *O Sapientia* alone. It is plain from the Antiphonary of Hartker, for instance, that the versicle in question, together with its response, was used on each day of the last week before the Nativity, and thus preceded each of the Greater Antiphons.[41] The constant use of this versicle in the last week of Advent, therefore, brings it into the same relation with each of the O-Antiphons, and renders the argument deduced from it doubtful.

To recapitulate: the words *veni ad liberandum nos,* and *jam noli tardare,* being the only source for Division X offered by the Antiphon *O Radix,* are in themselves not sufficient evidence for the dependence of the poet upon this Antiphon, for they are found scattered throughout the Advent Office. For the same reason, the somewhat far-fetched recourse to the response and versicle preceding the Greater Antiphons in the Sarum Use appears to exclude any connection of Division X with the Antiphon *O Sapientia.* In like manner, the Scriptural source of the *O Sapientia,* Ecclus. xxiv. 5, though proper in its application to the address of this division, constitutes a doubtful source for the

[38] P. 38.
[39] P. 39.
[40] P. 41.
[41] P. 34.—It is not an ordinary response, but what is termed a *Responsorium breve,* sung with "Gloria Patri," etc.

poet, since the forced relation implied in this suggestion causes the argument derived from it to appear strained and in contradiction to the recognized working methods of Cynewulf.

It would appear, then, that the investigations made by both Cook and May have given results too vague and indefinite to establish a source for the whole of Division X of *Christ I.* The various suggestions offered show in themselves that it is difficult to determine such a source. Further attempts at a proper interpretation of this section of the poem will, therefore, be welcome. For our purpose it is necessary that a more definite source be established, and if this task is essayed in the following pages, it is with the hope that future investigators may improve and correct the interpretation here given.

Since the source for Division X is not clear, it might be thought that the lines comprising it (lines 348-377) are after all not intended as a separate division of the poem. But it is almost certain that we are here dealing with an independent portion of *Christ I.* For, like the other divisions, it begins with *eala;* like the others, it presents an individual paraphrase, being addressed to Christ, while the preceding portion was addressed to Mary and the following lines refer to the Holy Trinity. It has the same structure to which we have been accustomed in the preceding paraphrases, being complete in its address and petition. All this would point to the use of an O-Antiphon as a basis for this section, even as the similarly constructed paraphrases of the other divisions are based on one or the other of the Greater Antiphons.

If the *O Radix* and the *O Sapientia* are excluded as probable sources for Division X, and none of the other known Greater Antiphons bears any trace of connection with it, the inference lies near that the poet employed in this portion of *Christ I* an O-Antiphon unknown to us at the present time. An Advent Antiphon of this kind may still be discovered; yet, with the existing knowledge of ancient Antiphonaries and Church books of every description, and with the diligent search made by various scholars and investigators, such a discovery is very problematical and indeed unlikely.[42]

[42] Dr. Karl Young of the University of Wisconsin, in a letter to the writer dated December 6, 1920, declared that, during his sojourn in European libraries, he had paid considerable attention to the "O" Antiphons in liturgical manuscripts, expecting to find additional "O's" in them. But he does not recall having found any that were not known to Professor Cook and other investigators.

In default of any knowledge pertaining to Greater Antiphons hitherto unknown to scholars in the *Christ,* another suggestion in explanation of Division X would seem appropriate. The suggestion is this, that the lines constituting this division be considered as the poet's own final "O." The whole section comes as a sort of climax to a finished work, the petition being marked by an intensity of feeling and a personal note seldom, if ever, equalled in any of the preceding divisions of *Christ I.* It would seem but natural that Cynewulf, after having paraphrased the last of the Greater Antiphons, should lay this personal tribute at the feet of Him whose advent he had so eloquently glorified and so earnestly implored in his immortal verse. And again, in relation to the contents of his own O-paraphrase, what would be more natural than that he should revert to his favorite theme of the co-eternity of the Son with the Father, and reiterate in the petition his own intense longing for deliverance from personal guilt and for the grace of converting his will to the ways of God? What an apt refrain all this presents to the poet's song on the Advent of Christ the Redeemer!

In confirmation of this theory we might point also to the symmetry which Cynewulf maintained in the structural outline of his *Christ I.* It was seen [43] that he places three O-Antiphons in each of his larger divisions of the poem. Since the last of these contained only the *O Rex Pacifice* and the *O mundi Domina,* and the complete set of Greater Antiphons had been employed before,[44] the need of an additional "O" was felt for the sake of maintaining the symmetrical proportions of the poem as a whole, and consequently the poet proceeded to compose one of his own as the final paraphrase of O's in this last larger division of *Christ I,* in the last group or "stanza" of O's.

But the probable source or sources for Division X are still to be ascertained. Whence did the poet derive the material for his own final O-paraphrase? The contents of this portion of *Christ I* were seen to be largely a repetition of themes already

[43] See page 17 above.

[44] Of the three Greater Antiphons (*O Sapientia, O Adonai, O Radix*) not treated in the preceding nine divisions of *Christ I,* two were seen to be inappropriate as sources for the present division, and the third (*O Adonai*) cannot even enter the list of probable sources in this portion of the poem. In the following section of this chapter the place of these three Antiphons in the *Christ* will be discussed.

treated. In the address (lines 348-358[a]) the principal theme is the co-existence of the Son with the Father from all eternity, his eternal generation from the Father; while in the petition (lines 358[b]-377) the poet asks for deliverance from the temptations of sin. Still the thoughts developed here show these themes in a different light than heretofore in the poem. We are given new aspects of the poet's favorite subjects.

In his treatment of the eternal generation of the Son, the poet goes a step farther than he did on a previous occasion, in lines 224-243[a].[45] There he introduced the story of the creation of light, the first creative act of God in the visible world, in order to emphasize the existence of the Son before anything had been created. In this division of the poem he stresses the eternal generation of the Son by bringing it into relation with the first creative act of God in the spirit, or invisible, world, viz., the creation of the angels (lines 351-355).[46] He furthermore introduces the co-existence of the Holy Spirit. It is the first instance (lines 357[b]-358[a]) in which the Holy Trinity is mentioned in the *Christ,* and the Doxology immediately following thus receives here its first intonation.

An analysis of the petition will likewise show a new development in oft-repeated thoughts. The idea of the Christian soul being a captive in this world, is not a new one in *Christ I.* Yet here (in lines 358[b]-377) the captivity of sin in which the soul is held is more fully specified as (a) the concupiscence of the flesh, in

hū wē sind geswencte *þ*urh ūre sylfra gewill. (line 362)

and

* * * wē fæh*þ*o wið *þ*ec
*þ*urh firena lust gefremed hæbben. (lines 368[b], 369)

and (b) the power which the evil spirits exert upon us, in

Habbað wræcmæcgas wērgan gæstas
* * * * * * * *
gebunden bealorāpum. (lines 363-365[a])

[45] See pages 30 f. above.

[46] Scholars have found the frequent repetitions in the *Christ* one of the marring features of Cynewulf's poetry with a disastrous effect upon the unity and orderly development of plot (cf., for example, Smithson, *The Old English Christian Epic,* 376). In many cases, as in the present one, a closer examination might reveal new phases and new developments in the recurring theme.

The poet seems to have had in mind the threefold temptation which surrounds the soul of the believer in this life: the temptation proceeding from the world, the flesh, and the devil, though he makes particular mention of the two last only. But these reduce men to a miserable plight which causes the poet to exclaim:

> hū wē tealtrigað tydran mōde,
> hwearfiað hēanlīce. (lines 371-372ª)

From these woes he asks to be delivered, in order to be able to do *þā sēllan þing* (line 376), that is, God's holy will.

While the material presented in Division X is thus largely a repetition of former themes, it is nevertheless cast into a new shape by the new and distinct treatment which it receives. The poet, accordingly, must have had a new and distinct source for the thoughts developed in this division. The regular channel for supplying his material the poet finds throughout the former divisions of *Christ I* in the Divine Office of the Advent season. Since the last of the Advent O's, the *O mundi Domina,* was paraphrased in the ninth division, this tenth division would properly find its material in a Christmas theme, being the final division before the Doxology.

And such we indeed find to be the case. The subject of the address in Division X is the eternal generation of the Son. This is plainly the special theme in the liturgy of the Church for the feast of the Nativity, or Christmas day itself. Where three Masses were celebrated on that day the first of these was commonly interpreted as commemorating the eternal birth of Christ from the Father, whatever applications were made for the two remaining Masses. Wherefore, the thought of the eternal generation of the Son is made the underlying thought of the Proper of the first or midnight-Mass. The Introit is:

> Dominus dixit ad me: Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te.

The Gradual of the same Mass is:

> Tecum principium in die virtutis tuae in splendoribus sanctorum, ex utero ante luciferum genui te.

The Verse with *Alleluja* after the Gradual repeats the very words of the Introit, while the Communion anthem repeats the words of the Gradual.

But it is to the Preface of this midnight-Mass that we must turn for the most probable source of Division X. We quote the Preface for the Mass *In Vigilia Domini in Nocte,*[47] from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great:[48]

> Vere dignum et justum est, aequum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Cujus divinae Nativitatis potentiam ingenita virtutis tuae genuit magnitudo. Quem semper Filium, et ante tempora aeterna genitum, quia tibi pleno atque perfecto aeterni Patris nomen non defuit, praedicamus, et honore, majestate atque virtute aequalem tibi cum Spiritu sancto confitemur, et in trino vocabulo unicam credimus Majestatem. Et ideo cum angelis, et archangelis, cum thronis, et dominationibus, cumque omni militia coelestis exercitus, hymnum gloriae tuae canimus sine fine dicentes:

In this Preface we seem to have the suggestion for the poet's own O-paraphrase in Division X. It is devoted, like Cynewulf's address, to a glorification of the eternal generation of the Son of God. It speaks of his *divina Nativitas* as the work of the Father's *ingenita magnitudo.* He was always His Son, *ante tempora aeterna genitus* (note the parallelism with *tu ante saecula nate*), and with the Father he is equal to the Holy Spirit in honor, majesty and power. While Cynewulf expresses the thoughts conveyed in the Preface principally by instituting a comparison between the generation of the Son and the creation of the angels, the influence of the Preface appears to be clear. Not only is the theme of the co-eternity of the Son with the Father provided here, but the third Person in the Holy Trinity, the Holy Spirit, is expressly mentioned as co-equal with the Father and the Son, and the angels are invited to join in our praise of God.

This brings us to the real connection which seems to exist be-

[47] This does not refer to what we now call the Vigil of the Nativity on December 24, but to the Holy Night itself. The Mass here is plainly the first of the three Masses assigned by the Sacramentary of St. Gregory to the feast of Christmas.

[48] *Liber Sacramentorum Si. Gregorii Magni,* in Migne, P. L., 78, 30. This Preface is also found among the "Praefationes Antiquae per anni circulum," in the *Liturgica Latinorum* of Iacobus Pamelius, Coloniae Agrippinae, 1571, ii. 550. Pamelius attributes it to the Gelasian Sacramentary, in which it also appears for the midnight-Mass of the Nativity. He also gives it among the Prefaces of the Ambrosian rite, *ibid.,* i. 441, where it is assigned, however, to the fifth Sunday of Advent.—cf. also M. Gerbert, *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemmanicae,* i. 209.

tween the Preface of the midnight-Mass and Division X of *Christ I*. The Preface is always the prelude to the *Sanctus* or "Trisagion" of the Mass.[49] In like manner is Division X immediately followed by the Doxology, a hymn of praise to the Holy Trinity, which (in lines 403-415) contains a faithful paraphrase of the *Sanctus* of the Mass. Of this Doxology I will presently treat in greater detail. It is sufficient here to direct attention to the admirable connection which exists both in *Christ I* and in the Christmas Preface between the theme of the eternal generation of the Son and the hymn of praise in honor of the Trinity immediately following. Accordingly, it appears highly probable that Cynewulf received his suggestion or inspiration for Division X from the Preface of the midnight-Mass on Christmas, so that this Preface might be considered the direct source for this portion of the poem.

While we are thus led to look upon the Preface in question as the source of Division X, other influences in the lines composing it cannot be denied. This is especially apparent in the second half of the division, the petition in lines 358ᵇ-377. Here the material does not seem to be taken from the Christmas service in the same degree as in the address. But we must remember that the clue to the sources upon which Cynewulf relied is always more evident from the address than from the petition, in which the personal emotions of the poet hold larger sway. If this division of *Christ I* should represent the poet's own "O," he would *a fortiori* be at liberty to develop his own thoughts in accordance with his personal feelings at the time of writing.

Nevertheless, the central thought of the petition, that of our captivity, appears to be taken again from the Christmas Office. The Prayer of the third Mass and of all parts of the Office for Christmas day is as follows:

> Concede, quaesumus omnipotens Deus: ut nos Unigeniti tui nova per carnem Nativitas liberet, quos sub peccati jugo vetusta servitus tenet. Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum. * * *

It is for the deliverance from the "ancient slavery under the subjection of sin" that the Church prays in her official Prayer for the feast of the Nativity. This slavery implies just what

[49] For a full explanation of the *Sanctus* in the Mass see Cook, 111 f.

Cynewulf expresses in the petition of Division X, our subjection to the lusts of the flesh and to the influences of the evil spirit.[50]

Another Prayer on which the poet may have partly relied is the Prayer for the Ember Saturday of Advent, which is the Saturday preceding the last Sunday of Advent. It is the following:

> Deus, qui conspicis, quia ex nostra pravitate affligimur: concede propitius; ut ex tua visitatione consolemur, Qui vivis et regnas, etc.

The phrase *quia ex nostra pravitate affligimur* seems to find its counterpart in line 362 of the *Christ,*

> hū wē sind geswencte þurh ūre sylfra gewill.

and the phrase *ut ex tua visitatione consolemur,* in lines 367ᵇ-368ᵃ,

> * * * þæt þīn hidercyme
> āfrēfre fēasceafte. * * *

Our conclusion with regard to Division X of *Christ I* is therefore this: In default of any existing Greater Antiphon which can safely be determined as constituting the source for this division, these lines may appropriately be considered as representing the poet's own "O," and the material incorporated in this portion of the poem is taken from the Christmas service, the chief source being the Preface of the midnight-Mass.

Division XI: Lines 378-415

This division of *Christ I* Cook bases on "two of the Antiphons for Lauds on Trinity Sunday, according to the Sarum Use."[51] They are,

> O Beata et Benedicta et Gloriosa Trinitas, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.
> Te jure laudant, Te adorant, Te glorificant omnes creaturae tuae, O Beata Trinitas.

Just why these two Antiphons should be restricted to the Sarum Use is not quite clear. Since the Added or Monastic O's used by Cynewulf are not contained in the Sarum Use, it would seem more natural to seek the Antiphons in question in an Antiphonary containing all the O-Antiphons employed in *Christ I.* Such is the Antiphonary of Hartker, in which we find the two

[50] For an analysis of the petition see pages 39 f. above.
[51] Cook, p. 108.

Trinity Antiphons in the Lauds of the Office called *Ystoria de sca. Trinitate,*[52] which follows the Sundays and ferias between Epiphany and the Sunday Septuagesima. In the Leofric Collectar [53] these Antiphons to the Holy Trinity appear immediately after the feast of the Epiphany for Sunday use. The "Trinity Sunday" of which Cook speaks was not kept as a special feast in the days of Cynewulf, each Sunday of the year being consecrated to the memory of the Holy Trinity. Whenever it was a common Sunday, that is, when no feast of our Lord or other great solemnity fell on a Sunday, the Antiphons of the Trinity were used. When speaking of the sources for Division XI, we should therefore refer to these two Antiphons as taken from the "Sunday service." From this it is clear that the Antiphons here employed by Cynewulf lay much nearer as a source than their use on the feast of the Trinity [54] would imply.

The two Antiphons in honor of the Trinity come into question as a source for Division XI of *Christ I* only as far as line 402. Lines 403-415 constitute the heavenly chorus of the angels, and are a faithful transcription of the *Sanctus* or "Trisagion" of the Mass, which is:

> Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus: Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt coeli et terra gloria tua. Hosanna in excelsis! Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna in excelsis!

It was seen above that the Doxology in *Christ I* thus presents a counterpart of the Angelic hymn following the chanting of the Preface in the Mass. And since the preceding portion of the poem appears to be based on the Christmas Preface, the connection here is natural and plain. The first part of this division (lines 378-402), therefore, may be looked upon as an introduction to this Angelic hymn, just as in the Preface of the Mass the *Sanctus* is introduced after the glorification of the respective mystery or feast, which in our case is the eternal generation of the Son of God.

Though the poet follows his sources rather closely in Division XI, the unifying element for the whole division appears to have

[52] *Antiphonary of Hartker*, p. 104.
[53] *The Leofric Collectar*, Harl. MS. 2961; ed. by E. S. Dewick, London, 1914, Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. 45.—cf. fol. 32^{b}-33^{a}.
[54] The feast of the Holy Trinity is observed on the Sunday after the feast of Pentecost or Whitsunday.

been furnished by another Antiphon which is now used in the Votive Office of the Angels. It is the following:

> Laudemus Dominum, quem laudant Angeli, quem Cherubim et Seraphim Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus proclamant.

It will be observed that both the Antiphon here given and the Doxology of Cynewulf show three parts. The thoughts of the Antiphon are disposed as follows: (a) *Laudemus Dominum;* (b) *quem laudant Angeli;* (c) *quem Cherubim et Seraphim Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus proclamant.*

Division XI of *Christ I* gives the same disposition of thoughts in its three parts as follows:

(a) Lines 378-384 develop the thought contained in the first member of the Antiphon, *Laudemus Dominum.* It is *we* who praise the Lord:

> * * * reordberende,
> earme eorðware, ealle mægene
> hergan hēalīce. * * * (lines 381ᵇ-383ᵃ)

(b) Lines 385-402 paraphrase the second member of the Antiphon, *quem laudant Angeli* (quem Cherubim et Seraphim proclamant). This whole part is devoted to the angels, to their ministries and sports before the throne of heaven, and to their manner of song.

(c) Lines 403-415 finally expand the third member of the Antiphon so as to produce the whole of that Angelic hymn which is merely intoned in this Antiphon.

Thus the Doxology of *Christ I* appears to have been carefully planned by the poet both in its construction and in the position which it holds in the poem. It completes the extensive hymn of praise which Cynewulf so skilfully wrought from the Greater Antiphons of the Advent season.

Division XII: Lines 416-439

is based on the Antiphon used on the Octave of Christmas:

> O admirabile commercium, Creator generis humani animatum corpus sumens, de Virgine nasci dignatus est: et procedens homo sine semine, largitus est nobis suam deitatem

In 1914 Professor Samuel Moore [55] published his discovery of

[55] In *Modern Language Notes,* xxix. 226 f.

this source. While he quoted only lines 416-421[a] as being based on this Antiphon, a closer examination will show that the influence of the Antiphon extends at least to line 428.

It is true, lines 421[b]-425 appear to be an interpolation. Yet the thought connection seems to be this: if

> nē þurh sǣd ne cwōm sigores āgend
> monnes ofer moldan; (lines 420-421[a])

then how did the Son of God come? Mary had herself asked this question of the angel Gabriel when he announced to her God's design to choose her as the mother of His Son. She had said, *quomodo fiet istud?* The angel replied, *virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi,*[56] and this answer is made the burden of the interpolated lines 421[b]-425:

> * * * ac þæt wæs mā(ra) cræft
> þonne hit eorðbūend ealle cūþan
> þurh geryne, hū hē, rodera þrim,
> heofona Hēahfrēa, helpe gefremede
> monna cynne þurh his mōdor hrif. (lines 421[b]-425)

Note the connection between *virtus* and *cræft,* between *Altissimi* and *Hēahfrēa,* and between *obumbrabit tibi* and *his mōdor hrif* which implies the same thought.

After this short interpolation explaining the manner of Christ's coming, the poet returns to the antiphonal passage: *et procedens * * * largitus est nobis suam deitatem* as follows:

> Ond, swā forð gongende, folca Nergend
> his forgifnesse gumum tō helpe
> dǣleð dōgra gehwām, Dryhten weoroda. (lines 426-8) [57]

This analysis shows conclusively, I think, that the Antiphon *O admirabile commercium* forms the basis for lines 416-428, thus extending farther in its influence than to line 421[a].

The remaining portion of this division, lines 429-439, is given over to a final exhortation by the poet to the praise and adoration of God. That, he says, is the true wisdom of life, for only through the love of his God can man hope to reach that eternal

[56] Luke, i. 35.

[57] Whitman, *The Christ of Cynewulf,* Boston, 1900, p. 16, translates line 426, "So continually the Savior of mankind." It should rather be, "And thus going forth, the Savior of mankind," in agreement with the Antiphon. Whitman's translation, it is well to observe, preceded the discovery of this source by Moore.—Cook (p. 245) explains *forgiefnes* as "bounty," "largess." This agrees well with the *largitus est* of the Antiphon.

reward "in the country where as yet he hath not come, in the joy of the land of the living, where he shall dwell blessed for evermore, there henceforth abiding world without end. Amen." [58]

This last section of *Christ I* was regarded by Cook [59] as a climactic or resumptive portion leading to the conclusion of the great theme of Christ's advent to men. From the knowledge that we now have of its source, however, this concluding division is seen to paraphrase an Antiphon belonging in Church use to the Octave of the feast of the Nativity. This fact would suggest that Cynewulf composed lines 416-439 some time after the Doxology had been written, for in the following chapter it will be seen how the poet followed precisely the Church use of his sources. Thus Division XII partakes of the nature of an addition or appendage to the theme proper of the *Advent,* especially since the symmetrical disposition of the O-paraphrases in *Christ I* seems to exclude it from the original plan of the poem.

My examination of the sources which form the bases for the twelve separate divisions in *Christ I* has given this result:

The sources determined by Cook are clear in all the divisions of the poem, except in Divisions VII, X, and XII. Though the direct source for Division VII, or the *Passus,* must remain undetermined, the material which has suggested its composition belongs to the Vigil of the Nativity, the ultimate source being the Gospel passage of that day, Matth., i. 18-21. Because the *Passus* appears out of place in the symmetrical scheme apparent in *Christ I* as a whole, it might be looked upon as an interpolation by a later writer. The source at which I have arrived in Division X is the Preface sung in the midnight-Mass on Christmas. Especially has the connection between this division and the following Doxology influenced the acceptance of this Preface as the source of Division X. The source for Division XII, discovered by Moore, has been extended to include lines 416-428.

In addition to the closer determination of these sources, attention was directed to various points of dispute connected with them. The unity of Division II was more fully established. The *O Sapientia* was eliminated as a source for lines 239-240, and for Division X. The *O Gabriel* was likewise excluded from Division IX, and the *O Radix* from Division X. The sources

[58] Whitman, l.c., p. 16.
[59] P. 113.

of the Doxology, Division XI, as far as lines 378-402 are affected, were shown to be derived from the common Sunday Office, and thus to have been in closer proximity to the feast of Christmas than they are at the present time in their use on Trinity Sunday.

But before a final estimate of the sources in *Christ I* can be had, an account must be rendered of the possible sources in the lost portion of the *Christ,* in order to arrive at a more accurate knowledge of the precise plan or scheme followed by Cynewulf in the construction of his poem.

3. The Sources of the Lost Portion

The poem of the *Christ* forms the very beginning of the manuscript in the Exeter Library, called the *Exeter Book.* Of this manuscript the first seven folios or fourteen pages have been destroyed, our poem continuing on folio 8[a] with the word *Cyninge* ("to the King"), thus launching immediately into the first division which is based on the Great Antiphon *O Rex gentium,* the first lines of which even are missing.[60] How many of the seven lost leaves of the manuscript were devoted to the subject of *Christ I* will, of course, always remain more or less a matter of conjecture.

A review of existing treatises on the *Christ* of Cynewulf reveals a considerable lack of attention to this portion lost at the beginning of the poem. It is true, there is very little definite information, if any, at hand concerning the lost leaves, and all that can be said about them must be more or less the result of speculation. Still the preserved portions of the *Christ,* and especially those of *Christ I,* should not be altogether devoid of some tangible clue concerning the probable content of the missing lines.

It is particularly when we are striving to ascertain the complete number of sources employed by Cynewulf in *Christ I* that the lacuna appearing at the beginning of the manuscript is most keenly felt. For the sources of the existing twelve divisions, if taken in their *ensemble,* present the same lacuna. And strangely, this lacuna appears in the same place as in the manuscript, at the beginning. Such a coincidence should give us almost definite

[60] Cook (p. 73) says that what is lost of this first division must cover the words *O Rex gentium, et desideratus earum* of the Antiphon, and thus can scarcely have exceeded a dozen lines, at most.—For a full description and general account of the Exeter Book see Cook, pp. xiii-xvi.

information about the content of the lost portion. But a closer examination of the question will make the point clearer.

In the study above of the sources which constitute the bases for the smaller divisions of *Christ I* it was seen that eight of them, i.e., all except Divisions VII, X, XI, and XII, are based upon one or the other of the Greater Antiphons of Advent. The respective Antiphons are: O Rex gentium; O Clavis David; O Hierusalem; O Virgo virginum; O Oriens; O Emmanuel; O Rex Pacifice; and O mundi Domina.

But how does this list of Greater Antiphons compare with the lists found in the Antiphonaries and Breviaries? To any student of the liturgy of the Roman Church the Cynewulfian set of Greater Antiphons must appear defective. For the absence of three Great O's, of the *O Sapientia,* the *O Adonai,* and the *O Radix,* finds no precedent in the history of the liturgy. It is well known that the first seven Greater Antiphons of St. Gregory's *Liber Responsalis*[61] have become from his time the standard set of Advent O's used in the Roman Church. With the exception of a single Antiphonary, the Vatican MS. B 79 as published by Tommasi,[62] all the Antiphonaries of the Roman Use contain the seven Greater Antiphons that take the first place in the *Liber Responsalis* of St. Gregory. They are: O Sapientia, O Adonai, O Radix, O Clavis David, O Oriens, O Rex gentium, and O Emmanuel.[63]

Because these seven Antiphons were accepted in all the churches following the Roman Use, they formed in each case the nucleus around which the added O's were in the course of time assembled wherever such additional Antiphons came into use. These additional O's were never allowed to replace or supersede the seven Great O's. In the treatises of all liturgiologists these seven O's are taken as the point of departure. Their list was considered so familiar, that they were often referred to as merely "The Seven O's" (*Septem O*). When Pope Pius V. (1566-1572) undertook a thorough reform of the Roman Breviary, he re-

[61] In Migne, P. L., 78, 732 f.

[62] Tommasi, *Opera Omnia,* ed. Vezzosi, Rome, 1749, iv. 28.

[63] Outside the Roman Use, as in the Mozarabic and Ambrosian Breviaries, no Great O's appear. So also in the first edition of Cardinal Quingon's Breviary of 1535; in later editions of the latter the three last O's in the Roman list were sometimes used; cf. Everard Green, "On the words *O Sapientia* in the Kalendar," in *Archæologia,* xlix, 236.

scinded all Advent O's that had been added to the customary number here and there, and retained the seven Great O's alone.

The absence of three of these seven O's in *Christ I* is consequently a striking feature of the poem. The three Antiphons not treated by Cynewulf, the *O Sapientia, O Adonai,* and *O Radix,* take the precedence in all the lists of O-Antiphons,[64] and it would be difficult to assume that Cynewulf did not include them in the scheme of his poem.

I realize, however, that it is necessary to obviate two objections that might be raised at this point. In the first place, it might be pointed out that Cynewulf was at liberty to choose his themes and exclude from his treatment of the Advent of Christ any number of specific sources. But the existing portion of the *Christ* seems to argue against this position. In it the poet is seen to employ as sources for his paraphrases all the additional O-Antiphons [65] that are found in the most complete Antiphonary of his time. From this procedure on the part of the poet it seems evident that he wished to present the full number of the original O's at least. Wherefore, such a degree of arbitrariness as the conscious omission of the three first Greater Antiphons would imply can hardly be imputed to him.

In the second place, the omission of all three O's in question might be denied on the ground that the *O Sapientia* and the *O Radix* at least are represented in lines 239-240, and lines 348-377, respectively. Yet the examination which I have made of these portions of *Christ I* [66] leads me to believe that the lines in question do not warrant the acceptance of these two Antiphons as constituting the sources for them intended by the poet. Besides, these two Antiphons appear too important to assign such secondary places to them in *Christ I.*

From all this it appears that the three missing O's can safely be placed in the missing portion of the *Christ.* The one lacuna covers the other. Because the three O's wanting in *Christ I* are just the three first of the Advent Antiphons, their proper place is at the beginning of the poem. It will not be denied by any

[64] The only exception recorded is that of the Antiphonary of Metz as reported by Amalarius; cf. Amalarius, *De Ordine Antiphonarii,* in Migne, P. L., 105, 1266-69; cf. also Cook, p. 85.

[65] With the possible exception of the *O Gabriel,* for it seems to be absent from *Christ I.* Cook (p. 73) would put it also in the lost portion of the poem.

[66] See pages 30, 33 above.

student of the *Christ* that some part of the poem is missing in the manuscript as preserved. The poet must certainly have treated one or more definite themes in that lost portion, and judging from the opening theme of the preserved portion, those themes must have been paraphrases of Greater Antiphons similar to the *O Rex gentium* paraphrase of lines 1-17.

With the *O Sapientia,* the *O Adonai,* and the *O Radix* in the first larger division of *Christ I,* moreover, the symmetrical proportions apparent in the preserved manuscript for Part I of the *Christ* would find their perfection. For the practical purpose of this study, therefore, the lost portion of *Christ I* will be accepted as containing at least the three Great O's not found in the remaining divisions, the *O Sapientia,* the *O Adonai,* and the *O Radix.*

The sources arrived at in the preceding study of the contents of *Christ I,* in conjunction with the results of the investigations previously carried on by Cook and Moore, are brought together in the following table, which, by retaining the larger divisions marked in the manuscript, except for Division VII which is not based on an O-Antiphon, shows how the symmetry of the poem is maintained in the lost portion:

–	(Lost Portion)			O Sapientia
–	"	"		O Adonai
–	"	"		O Radix
I.	Lines	1-17	based on	O Rex gentium
II.	"	18-49	" "	O Clavis David
III.	"	50-70	" "	O Hierusalem
IV.	"	71-103	" "	O Virgo virginum
V.	"	104-129	" "	O Oriens
VI.	"	130-163	" "	O Emmanuel
VII.	"	164-213	" "	Matth. i. 18-21. *Passus*
VIII.	"	214-274	" "	O Rex Pacifice
IX.	"	275-347	" "	O mundi Domina
X.	"	348-377	" "	Poet's own "O": Christmas Preface
XI.	"	378-415	" "	Trinity Antiphons. *Doxology*
XII.	"	416-439	" "	O admirabile commercium

With the sources of *Christ I* as they appear here the subsequent discussion will have to deal. Since the purpose of this study is

to investigate the influence of these sources upon the peculiar arrangement of material in the poem, to ascertain the relation which the smaller divisions bear to each other and to the larger outline of *Christ I*, it was first necessary to establish as nearly as possible the precise succession of sources as a working basis for that investigation. Such a basis, I believe, was reached in the foregoing study.

III

THE SOURCES AS FOUND IN ACTUAL CHURCH USE

1. General Observations

With the more definite knowledge of the sources of the twelve divisions of *Christ I* which Cook first made current to students of the *Christ,* a better understanding of Cynewulf's poem has since prevailed. Not only have the complexities that marred earlier investigations been cleared away, but a way was broken into the comprehension of that spirit of religious fervor with which the whole poem is pervaded. Only through a deeper knowledge of the influences of the Greater Antiphons and the celebration of Advent in the mediæval Church upon the poet, can we arrive at a true valuation of his work and find spiritual enjoyment in the study of such a masterpiece as the *Christ* represents.

The addition to the knowledge of the sources of *Christ I* made by Moore, and the further discoveries by myself, as pointed out in the last chapter, give us a wider field in which to extend our knowledge of the true relation existing between the *Christ* and the sources employed in it.

If an appreciation of the spiritual meaning of the sources and of their influence in the life of the Church reveals to us the spirit out of which the poetic version of those sources was born, does the connection between sources and poem end there? Is there not perhaps a connection also between the very external structure or plan of *Christ I* and the *Latin originals as Cynewulf found them?* That is precisely the field still lying unexplored. For a mere knowledge of the text of the O-Antiphons and other sources in *Christ I* can lead us no farther than to regard them simply as the bases of the individual paraphrases in the poem, and nothing more. The plan of the poem will still retain its chaotic structure. Cynewulf will still be considered arbitrary in the use of his material, disdaining to follow an outline offered in the very book from which he drew most of his sources.

Hence, in order to arrive at an appreciation of the full relation existing between the sources of *Christ I* and the poem itself, it is not sufficient to regard these sources merely as the well of

inspiration for the poet, or even as the mere storehouse of that definite material through which the poetic inspiration was to function. Their influence certainly must lie deeper. Indeed, Cook [1] seems to intimate as much, when he says:

> * * * it is apparent that we must conceive of Cynewulf as so *thrilled by the sweet and solemn chanting* of the Greater Antiphons of Advent, and so imbued with their spirit through reflection upon their rich devotional and doctrinal contents, that he gladly yielded to the impulse to reproduce them in English under the form of variation.[2]

It is, accordingly, only in harmony with the knowledge we have of Cynewulf as a man and a poet that we conceive of him as attending in person the chanting of the O-Antiphons in the Divine Office, and thus receiving the inspiration for the succeeding portions of *Christ I.* This view precludes the assumption that Cynewulf had the Antiphonary at his elbow when composing his poem, and that he selected from the list of Greater Antiphons appearing there the respective O's as his fancy would dictate. On the contrary, the sources became for him, as it were, living themes, and he proceeded to paraphrase them as living thoughts of his own inner self, stamped with his own religious views and emotions. The very order in which these paraphrases appear in the poem must then be a natural one without any forced positions. They must flow, not indeed from a lifeless and cold list contained in any one book, but from the very life which the distinct members of that list receive in their proper liturgical setting in the Divine Office.

To ascertain their proper setting will be the task of the present chapter. For this purpose it will be necessary to study the sources of *Christ I* as they were actually used by the mediæval Church in her service, for only through a knowledge of that use will the liturgical setting of these sources appear and permit a comparison of their order of succession with the arrangement of material in the poem of Cynewulf.

The first step towards a proper appreciation of the Church use of the sources employed by Cynewulf in *Christ I* must be the adjustment of any false impressions which the customary mechanical tabulation of these sources in the service books of the

[1] P. xlii. .
[2] The italics are mine.

Church might create. Since the principal sources of our poem are the Greater Antiphons of Advent, this applies more specifically to the list of these O-Antiphons in the Antiphonary.

An examination of almost any Antiphonary or Breviary will show that the Greater Antiphons of Advent are assembled at one place in the book or codex, though they are to be used on various days. The place assigned to them in these books is usually before the fourth Sunday in Advent,[3] or immediately preceding the Office for the Vigil of the Nativity.[4] In more modern Breviaries the date of the month on which they are to be used is attached, but in the ancient Antiphonaries this is not the case. Why, it will be asked, were the O-Antiphons assembled in a list in the Church books, and not distributed over the days on which they were chanted? It was for the following practical reason.

The Advent season is a preparation for the feast of the Nativity or Christmas. It comprises four weeks,[5] and the Office of Advent is accordingly arranged in weeks, not in days of the month. Because Christmas is attached to a fixed day of the month, December 25, and the Office is arranged in four full weeks, the last week of Advent (in which the O-Antiphons are being chanted) is constantly shifting, as the day of Christmas shifts from one day of the week to the other. If December 25 falls on a Monday, the day preceding will be the fourth Sunday in Advent, but this fourth Sunday will then be without its ferial or week-days, though in the Office books the fourth week appears complete.

The chanting of the O's is attached to fixed days of the month, like the Christmas festival; but they must find their place in an Office arranged according to weeks and days of the week. Thus it is necessary to assemble them into one convenient place, where they can be referred to on the days when they are used. If, for instance, the Antiphon *O Sapientia* is to be sung on December 17, where should this Antiphon find its proper place in the Antiphonary? It does not register an Office for December 17,

[3] In the Breviary of today they precede even the ferias or weekdays of the third week in Advent, that is, they follow the Office of the third Sunday.

[4] Thus in the Antiphonary of Hartker, pp. 40 f.

[5] The number of Advent weeks varied in the early Church. The Gelasian Sacramentary has five, the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Rites have six weeks. cf. Binterim, Denkwürdigkeiten, v. 167; Dom Cabrol, "L'Avent Liturgique," in *Revue Bénédictine*, xxii, 484 ff; Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung*, i. 3.

for it runs with the days of this or that week of Advent. But when December 17 comes, the chanters will turn to the list of O's and look there for the particular Antiphon to be sung on that day.

Whatever place the list of O-Antiphons occupied in the service books of the Church, it found its adaptation in agreement with various local usages. For this reason a certain order in the arrangement of the list does not necessarily point to the same order in the chanting of the Antiphons. From the Antiphonaries of the early Middle Ages it would appear that a definite order was mostly accepted in the list of the O's, the order derived from St. Gregory the Great. But local variant customs in the use of these Antiphons did exist, and these sometimes called for a slight re-arrangement of the O's. But from the lists in the Antiphonaries themselves, these variant customs often do not appear.

A clue to the divergent uses of the O-Antiphons, in the face of the standard arrangement of the list, can sometimes be found in the directions given at various places in the Antiphonary. An example of this is found in the Antiphonary of Hartker, the earliest known Antiphonary containing all the O's employed by Cynewulf. In this Antiphonary (pp. 40 f.) the list of Greater Antiphons is given in its usual order, but the rubrics[6] which refer to various O-Antiphons within the last week of Advent appear to run counter to the established order of O's in the list.

The Greater Antiphons are listed as follows in the Antiphonary of Hartker:[7] (1) O Sapientia; (2) O Adonai; (3) O Radix Jesse; (4) O Clavis David; (5) O Oriens; (6) O Rex gentium; (7) O Emmanuel; (8) O Virgo virginum; (9) O Gabriel; (10) O Rex Pacifice; (11) O mundi Domina; (12) O Hierusalem.

This is the customary order maintained in presenting the Greater Antiphons. It might be called the standard or conventional order. The first eight Antiphons of this list have the same place in the *Liber Responsalis* of St. Gregory,[8] and this order

[6] The *rubrics* in the Breviary are the rules laid down for the recitation of the Divine Office, as well as any directions or references placed between the text. They are usually printed in red, hence the name. Cf: Dom Cabrol, in *Catholic Encyclopædia,* xiii. 216—May calls the rubric a "gloss," see page 34 above.

[7] Pp. 40 f.—but in it the Antiphons are not numbered.

[8] Migne, P. L., 78, 732.

was faithfully kept in the transcription of the Antiphonaries. These eight O's are followed by four Antiphons which came into use in the course of time. The four additional O's would in no case be inserted between the others in the list, because of their later adoption and of the respect in which the original O's were held. Yet in their use they could be taken before the eight were finished, that is, they could be used along with the other Great O's for special services, according to the custom which prevailed.

That this list of Greater Antiphons was adapted in various ways appears to be clear from the same Antiphonary of Hartker. Within the last week of Advent and the Christmas week this Antiphonary contains rubrical directions implying a use of the O's differing from that suggested by the list of these Antiphons on pages 40 f. The following directions pertain to the manner in which the O's were to be used:

On page 31 the rubric for the Antiphon of the Magnificat on Saturday preceding the last Sunday of Advent is, *Ant. O Sap., vel alia de illis sicut evenerit.*

On page 34, for the Antiphon of the Magnificat on the last Sunday of Advent (i.e., the day following the rubric above), *Ant. O Oriens.*

Again on page 34, for the Antiphon of the Magnificat in the week preceding the Nativity, *Ant. O Sapientia.*

On page 44, for the Antiphon *ad crucem* in the Vespers of the Vigil of the Nativity, *O Hierusalem civitas.*

On page 52, for the Antiphon *ad crucem* in the Vespers of Christmas day, *Ant. O mundi Domina.*

On page 69, for the Antiphon *ad crucem* on the feast of the Holy Innocents (December 28), *Ant. O Virgo virginum.*

From these directions it would appear that the Antiphon *O Oriens* is affixed to the last Sunday of Advent, while the rubric of page 31 apparently directs that the Antiphons should be taken in their regular order laid down in the list on page 40. The remark on page 34, which assigns the Antiphon *O Sapientia* to the Vespers in the week preceding Christmas, seems to apply to all the O's in their respective turn, and not to the first of these alone. The *O Hierusalem,* the *O mundi Domina,* and the *O Virgo virginum* are assigned indiscriminately to the service *ad crucem,*[9] which consisted of the "memorials" after the Magnificat. In

[9] A fuller discussion of this service follows below.

this use, moreover, they are not taken in the order which they hold in the list of O-Antiphons on page 40. There they follow thus: O Virgo virginum, (O Gabriel), (O Rex Pacifice), O mundi Domina, O Hierusalem. Here the order is inverted: O Hierusalem, O mundi Domina, O Virgo virginum. And what disposition was made of the O Gabriel and the O Rex Pacifice? The Antiphonary is silent regarding them.

Thus it appears that the list of O-Antiphons in an Antiphonary was variously adapted in actual use, that this list is merely a list for the sake of convenience, and perhaps also for the sake of preserving the traditional order in it. The example given here of Hartker's Antiphonary could no doubt be multiplied from similar rubrics in various other Antiphonaries, but for our purpose this instance is sufficient to show that the actual Church use of the Antiphons in question can be ascertained only through an interpretation of the directions given in the service books for the celebration of the Divine Office and for the various uses connected with it. The mechanical tabulation of these Cynewulfian sources in the Antiphonary must not lead us into the error of jumping too hastily at conclusions not justified by actual Church use.

The various adaptations which the Greater Antiphons undoubtedly received in the various churches of mediæval Christianity lead us to the second consideration in our endeavor to ascertain the actual Church use of these Antiphons. In dealing with the liturgical practices of the early Middle Ages, we must divest ourselves of the notions which the present-day well-established conformity and uniformity have created. In those early days there was as yet no definite *ordo* prescribed for all the churches of Christendom. The epoch to which Cynewulf belongs presents that stage in the history of the liturgy, in which the minor details surrounding the official functions and prayers of the Church blossomed forth into a wonderful profuseness and variety of forms. The intense religious fervor of those ages found its expression in the many additions that were constantly being made in various localities to the existing formulas for worship prescribed by the Church.

Far from disapproving these accretions to the devotional content of her liturgy, the Church encouraged them by granting the widest liberties in adapting and increasing the previously

sanctioned forms of her ceremonial. It may not be amiss to call attention, for instance, to the observations made by Amalarius, who is perhaps the most distinguished liturgical writer of the early Middle Ages and a close contemporary of Cynewulf himself.[10] In presenting the O-Antiphons in the order followed at Metz in his time, Amalarius points to the divergence which his Antiphonary showed from that of the Roman Use. He was astonished at the wide discrepancy in liturgical matters between mother and daughter church (Rome and Metz), saying:[11]

> Quae memorata volumina contuli cum nostris Antiphonariis, invenique ea discrepare a nostris non solum in ordine, verum etiam in verbis et multitudine responsoriorum et antiphonarum, quas nos non cantamus. Nam in multis rationabilius statuta reperi nostra volumina quam essent illa. Mirabar quomodo factum sit quod mater et filia tantum a se discreparent.

The same early liturgiologist records documentary proof of the liberties granted in particular to the English Church. For, as a justification of the liberties which he had himself taken in arranging the Antiphonary for the cathedral church of Metz, he quotes the famous correspondence between Pope Gregory the Great and Augustine of England.[12] St. Augustine inquired of the Pontiff:

> Cum una sit fides sunt Ecclesiarum diversae consuetudines, et altera consuetudo missarum in Romana Ecclesia, atque altera in Gallia tenetur.

Pope Gregory replied:

> Novit fraternitas tua Romanae Ecclesiae consuetudinem in qua se meminit nutritam; sed mihi placet ut sive in Romana, sive in Galliarum, seu in qualibet Ecclesia aliquid invenisti quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, et in Anglorum Ecclesia, quae adhuc ad fidem nova est, institutione praecipua, quae de multis Ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas; non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt. Ex singulis ergo quibusque Ecclesiis quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt elige, et haec quasi in fasciculum collecta, apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem depone.

[10] Amalarius wrote in 820.

[11] *De Ordine Antiphonarii*, in Migne, P. L., 105, 1243.

[12] *Ibid.*, 1244 f.—This correspondence is said by Amalarius to be recorded in the *Historia Anglorum*, book i. chapter v. Just what history is here meant has apparently never been ascertained.

By the time that Cynewulf as a monk or a priest had become acquainted with the liturgy of the English Church, such indults granted by the Pope could have resulted in a specifically English Antiphonary as rich and varied in content as any contained in the churches of the Continent. For it is remarkable that in his early day Cynewulf shows a knowledge of all the Greater Antiphons (except perhaps of the *O Gabriel*) that are found in the Antiphonary of Hartker, a manuscript of the monastery of St. Gall, which is assigned by Dom Mocquereau to the late tenth or early eleventh century.[13] Yet, the "consuetudo" which Pope Gregory wished to see established in England may easily account for variations in the minor details of the Office, such as a slight difference in the order of the O-Antiphons would imply. Even if the Antiphonaries of the Continent were faithfully copied in the monasteries and cathedral churches of England, their own "consuetudo" might justify any local adaptations of the copied books as more suitable to their needs and customs.

While these few general observations on the adaptability of the antiphonal list of Greater Antiphons for local use, and on the wide liberties enjoyed in liturgical matters by the mediæval Church, would seem to modify to a great extent the charge of wilfulness (or is it a compliment to his originality?) on the part of Cynewulf in the employment of his sources, a more detailed account of the particular sources used by him should lead us to more definite conclusions. The sources of the twelve divisions in *Christ I* fall into three classes, the seven Great O's, the Added or Monastic O's, and the other sources which do not belong to any set of Greater Antiphons. This distinction in the sources will aid in acquiring a clearer conception of their distinctive uses in the service of the Church, and render their comparison with the material in *Christ I* more fruitful.

[13] Liturgical writers of the present day unfortunately do not take sufficient account of the evidences furnished by the study of the literary remains of Old England. In many instances they still rely solely upon the inaccurate statements so often found in mediæval writers. Thus, for example, they continue to dispute over the possible date of the *O mundi Domina,* when as early as the eighth century Cynewulf is known to have used it. The common error of placing the *O Thoma Didyme* in date of composition in the thirteenth century, is persistently carried on, though this Antiphon is referred to on page 7 of Hartker's Antiphonary of the tenth century. (Cf. for this error, Dom Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year,* "Advent," p. 508; Everard Green, in *Archæologia,* xlix. 227; Cook, p. xxxvii; and others.)

2. The Seven Universal O's

By the "Seven Universal O's" we mean the seven Greater Antiphons which have always been in universal use in the Church, wherever the Roman Use was followed. They are first found in the *Liber Responsalis* [14] of St. Gregory the Great, and are now alone retained in the Roman Breviary as reformed by Pope Pius V. and enjoined in his Bull *Quod a nobis postulat* of July 9, 1568. In the Breviary of today these seven O's follow in the order in which they are found in the *Liber Responsalis,* and they are: O Sapientia, O Adonai, O Radix Jesse, O Clavis David, O Oriens, O Rex gentium, and O Emmanuel.

These have accordingly been called the "O's of the Pian Breviary," [15] but it is not quite correct to refer to them as the "Seven Gregorian O's," for St. Gregory, in his *Liber Responsalis,* clearly enumerates eight Antiphons beginning with "O," viz., the seven now retained as mentioned above, and the *O Virgo virginum.*[16] It is true that after the time of Gregory we find these mentioned as contained in the Antiphonary of Metz; [17] they are the first eight in the Antiphonary of Hartker, in the Codices Forojulienses,[18] in the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo of the twelfth century [19] (but with a slightly different order), in the Sarum Use,[20] in the Aberdeen Breviary of 1508,[21] in the Leofric Collectar,[22] etc.

---

[14] In Migne, P. L., 78, 732 f.

[15] Cf. Green, *Archæologia,* xlix, 221.

[16] Migne, P. L., 78, 732.—Odericus (*Ordo Officiorum Eccl. Senensis,* ed. Trombelli, pp. 19 f.), writing in 1213, states that the seven O's alone are found in the Antiphonary of St. Gregory, *has tantum septem posuit Gregorius in antiphonario.* Either he had in mind an Antiphonary different from the one that has come down to us, or he committed an error. If it is an error, writers have certainly been persistent in propagating it.—In the present Breviary the *O Virgo virginum* is omitted from the list of Advent O's, but retained for the feast of The Expectation of the Delivery of the Virgin Mary, December 18, wherever this feast is observed.

[17] Amalarius, *De Ordine Antiphonarii,* Migne, P. L., 105, 1267 ff.

[18] De Rubeis, *Dissertationes Duae,* Venice, 1754, p. 453; quoted by Green in *Archæologia,* xlix, 225.

[19] Published in *Paléographie Musicale,* ix. 27.

[20] *Breviarium ad Usum Sarum,* ed. by Proctor and Wordsworth, 1882.

[21] *Breuiarium Aberdonense,* ed. by W. Blew for the Maitland Club, London, 1854, vol. ii.

[22] *The Leofric Collectar,* ed. by E. S. Dewick for the Bradshaw Society, London, 1914, i. fol. 10[a].

eight O's in almost all Antiphonaries and Breviaries. They are

We should therefore speak of the "Eight Gregorian O's," for they seem to have come into general use after the time of Gregory. Yet, since the *O Virgo virginum* was always used more or less distinctly as an "additional O," [23] sometimes only on the feast of the Annunciation and subsequently on the feast of the Expectation, we shall assign it to the following discussion of the Added or Monastic O's. Nevertheless, it stands as a "Gregorian O" from the time of St. Gregory to the reform of Pius V. In adopting for the seven Great O's the collective term "The Seven Universal O's," we do not feel guilty of violating justice towards the great Pope St. Gregory, for we have no evidence that these seven Greater Antiphons originated with him, though he appears to have been the first to give them official sanction by receiving them into his Antiphonary. They may be of more ancient date than we would suspect.

The order which the seven Universal O's most commonly take in the various Antiphonaries is the one given them by St. Gregory and retained in the Pian Breviary. There seems to be no inherent reason for this particular order. Just what determined it we do not know. But some vigilant observers have pointed out that the seven O's in the Gregorian order form an acrostic if taken inversely. That is, if the initial letters of the titles following the word "O" are read upward, we obtain the words *Ero cras.* Everard Green [24] remarks that this acrostic gives no little coloring to the words *cras* and *crastina* which occur eighteen times in the services for the Vigil of Christmas in the Roman Breviary. And Thurston [25] says in answer to the question whether or not this acrostic can be considered intentional:

> Considering the popularity of all kinds of acrostics with such early ecclesiastical writers as Ennodius, Sedulius, and other poets, I am tempted to believe that the effect may very probably have been designed, and seeing that the Roman *Liber Responsalis* and *Breviary* have always preserved this order, the coincidence ought to count for something in favor of the hypothesis that the antiphons are of Roman origin and early date.

It cannot be denied that such tricks of language as shown in the acrostic connected with the O's are in keeping with the spirit

[23] Amalarius expressly calls it an "added" O; cf. Migne, P. L., 105, 1269.
[24] *Archæologia,* xlix. 223, note.
[25] "The Great Antiphons: Heralds of Christmas," in *The Month,* cvi. 625.

of the early Middle Ages, and that their influence was carried even into the liturgy of the Church. But no ecclesiastical writer of that age is known to have pointed out the acrostic in question. Still, allowing for the possibility of such an influence in the present arrangement of the Greater Antiphons, it proves all the more clearly that there was no deeper and inherent foundation for the order of succession given to them in the Antiphonary. If that order had depended merely upon such external coincidences as an acrostic,[26] the various churches could more freely follow their own customs in re-arranging the list of O's in their actual chanting to suit the peculiar local exigencies.

Another influence upon the arrangement of the Advent O's in the Antiphonary might be sought in the mystical interpretations that were commonly put upon them in the Middle Ages. It is found that, again in the spirit of the age, a symbolical meaning was usually attached to nearly everything connected with the liturgy, extending, in the matter of the O's, to their number as well as to their order of succession and the manner in which they were to be chanted and intoned in the Office. But in every case, I believe, it will be found that these interpretations were a later introduction, and that they followed after the particular number, order, or manner of Church use had been determined in the various localities. Thus Amalarius,[27] after giving the variant order in use at Metz, brings the seven Universal O's in connection with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, as enumerated in Isaias, xi. 2, 3. Honorius of Autun,[28] writing in the twelfth century, follows the usual Gregorian order, but he, too, makes the seven O's agree with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit in the order given by Isaias. In either case the application appears strained and was plainly made to cover an existing arrangement in the order of the Advent O's.

---

[26] In explanation of the peculiar order of the sources in *Christ I* it might be thought that Cynewulf himself had possibly been influenced by a desire to form a similar acrostic with the opening words of his paraphrases. In this connection it may be mentioned that the six divisions preceding the *Passus* give the acrostic *gewyrc* thus: *C*yninge (line 1), *R*eccend (line 18), *Y*erūsalēm (for Hierūsalēm, line 50), *W*īfa wynn (line 71), *Ē*arendel (line 104), *G*ǣsta God (line 130). It is not clear, however, what the poet could imply by *gewyrc*, unless the missing portion of the poem offered an illuminating addition to the word.

[27] Migne, P. L., 105, 1267.

[28] *Gemma Animae*, in Migne, P. L., 172, 644.

But the actual Church use of the Greater Antiphons is gathered more definitely from the Antiphonaries themselves. On page 57 above I have pointed out an instance in the Antiphonary of Hartker, in which the Antiphon *O Oriens* seems to be attached to the last Sunday of Advent, despite the strict order of succession given in the list of the O's in the same Antiphonary. Yet we have two Antiphonaries, at least, in which even the list of the seven Universal O's is slightly different from that of the *Liber Responsalis.* They are the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo, both of the twelfth century.[29] In these two manuscripts [30] the order of the Advent O's is as follows: (1) O Sapientia; (2) O Adonai; (3) O Radix Jesse; (4) O Clavis David; (5) O Rex gentium; (6) O Emmanuel; (7) O Oriens; (8) O Virgo virginum; (9) In natali Si. Thomae apostoli, O Thoma Didyme.

Here we have two cases of Continental Benedictine use, in which one of the seven Universal O's was taken out of its customary place. It is the Antiphon *O Oriens* which, instead of preceding the *O Rex gentium* and the *O Emmanuel,* follows them. Whether this practice of permitting variations in the order of the O-Antiphons was multiplied throughout the vast Benedictine Order of those days, we have no means of knowing. Perhaps, with the publication of further hidden codices, new evidences of such a procedure will be brought to light. At any rate, these two instances show that, besides the classical inversion of the Gregorian order in the O 's reported by Amalarius from Metz, evidences of occasional minor changes in the succession of Advent O's are not altogether wanting. Indeed, such a radical difference as the Antiphonary of Metz discloses may never be found in England; but customs affecting minor differences in the use and order of the O-Antiphons may easily have found their way from the monasteries of Italy, Spain, or Austria, into Northumbria.

If we compare the order of the seven Universal O's as found in *Christ I* with the order laid down in the *Liber Responsalis,* that is, with the standard order of O's, we observe that Cynewulf

[29] *Antiphonaire Monastique* (XII[e] siècle): Codex 601 de la Bibliothèque Capitulaire de Lucques. Published in Paléographie Musicale, vol. ix. (1906).—The Antiphonary of Toledo ("Codex 48.14 Bibl. de la Cathédrale de Tolède") is identical with that of Lucca, being also of Italian origin.

[30] P. 27.

allows merely a slight inversion, such as the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo disclose. In *Christ I* only one of the seven Universal O's is wrenched from its fixed place in Gregory's Antiphonary. It is the Antiphon *O Rex gentium* which, instead of following the *O Clavis* and *O Oriens,* precedes them. In the following table the various arrangements of the seven Universal O's are placed side by side:

Liber Responsalis.	*Amalarius.*	*Lucca & Toledo.*	*Christ I.*
I. O Sapientia	O Sapientia	O Sapientia	O Sapientia
II. O Adonai	O Clavis	O Adonai	O Adonai
III. O Radix	O Emmanuel	O Radix	O Radix
IV. O Clavis	O Radix	O Clavis	O Rex gentium
V. O Oriens	O Oriens	O Rex gentium	O Clavis
VI. O Rex gentium	O Adonai	O Emmanuel	O Oriens
VII. O Emmanuel	O Rex gentium	O Oriens	O Emmanuel

With the acrostic *ero cras* in mind, it will be easy to detect the differences in the order maintained by Amalarius, the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo, and *Christ I.* While the order given by Amalarius is helter-skelter in comparison with the standard order of the *Liber Responsalis,* that of both the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo and *Christ I* needs the adjustment of but a single Antiphon. In the first instance it is the *O Oriens,* in the latter the *O Rex gentium.* Wherefore, we cannot avoid a strong suspicion that Cynewulf knew and used an Antiphonary with just a slight disarrangement in the Advent O's, such as the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo display. The possible objection, that four centuries intervened between Cynewulf and the two Continental Antiphonaries here adduced, loses much of its weight when we bear in mind that at least two centuries also separate the *Liber Responsalis* from the writing of the *Christ.* There was ample time for the introduction of minor changes in the liturgy. Moreover, if the monastic use in Italy shows variations in the order of the O-Antiphons, the monastic use in England could do the same. It is now well established that the monasteries of Northern England stood in lively communication with those of the Continent, including Italy.

It is not within the scope of my study to inquire into the full Church use connected with the Greater Antiphons of Advent, as manifested in their particular number, their day of inception in

the Divine Office, their manner of being intoned by various Church dignitaries, and similar phases of the subject. This Church use is here considered solely from the viewpoint of the order of succession in which the O's were taken. And while, even in this particular as affecting especially the seven Universal O's, the Antiphonaries present but limited evidence, the evidence at hand does point out some definite facts bearing on the use of the seven O's in the Office of the Church. It shows that the list of O-Antiphons was adapted to various uses; that the directions given in the Antiphonaries themselves apparently contradict the strict sequence of Antiphons maintained in the list (as in the case of the *O Oriens* in the Antiphonary of Hartker); that slight variations in the order of the seven Universal O's themselves did exist (as shown by the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo). There does not appear to be any inherent reason for the particular order given in the *Liber Responsalis,* and nowhere is an official statement found commanding any particular order in the use of the Greater Antiphons.

From all this it would appear to verge on presumption, if we denied the possibility of a knowledge, on the part of Cynewulf, of any but the standard order of O's found in Gregory's Antiphonary. He may well have known and used an Antiphonary that presented the Universal O's in the very order of their succession in *Christ I.* In fact, his order in the poem might even argue for the Antiphonary constructed on the same plan. But had he followed the standard Antiphonary of the Roman use, the customs prevailing in his particular church or monastery could still account for a slight difference in the actual *chanting* of the O's. That Cynewulf appears rather to have used his sources, not as they are contained in the service books, but as they are taken in the Divine Office, will become clearer in the discussion of the Added O's and other sources of *Christ I.*

3. The Added or Monastic O's

In addition to the seven Universal O's, other Antiphons, constructed on the same plan as these, came into use from very early times, as the poem of the *Christ* itself shows. Of these additional O-Antiphons Tommasi[31] says: *An Monachorum sint*

[31] *Opera omnia,* ed. Vezzosi. iv. 182, note 1.

additamenta, ignoro, and Cook[32] remarks on this that, in the opinion of the best authorities, they are of monastic origin, adding:

> This is quite in consonance with the historic fact that the development of the liturgy was in large measure due to the monks (see Batiffol, chaps. i and ii). The arch-cantor John, whom Benedict Biscop brought into England, was, it will be remembered, abbot of St. Martin's monastery at Rome (Bede 4. 18). We shall not be far astray, I believe, if we suppose these four Antiphons to be of Benedictine origin.

We have therefore called these Antiphons the Added or Monastic O's, in contrast to the seven Universal O's. Cook[33] also uses the term "occasional Antiphons" to designate these O's. This is quite apt, for, as distinguished from the Universal O's, they were limited in their use to individual churches, mostly monastic, and even in the Office itself, it will be seen presently, they were often employed for special occasions only, not being assigned to certain fixed days as were the seven Universal O's.

If we examine the lists of the Advent O's in the Antiphonaries, we observe that wherever any Antiphons were used in addition to the seven Universal O's, these were invariably treated as additions. That means, they always followed the seven O's, no matter how many of them were added. In this respect they appear to have the same fixed order as the seven Universal O's present. But it would not be in harmony with actual Church use, if we were to infer that the Added or Monastic O's were always chanted after the seven Universal O's had been finished in the Divine Office. No doubt they were thus used in some churches in which the singing of the Advent O's began early enough to allow each of the Added O's a separate day in the kalendar.[34]

But in the majority of cases the chanting of the Advent O's did not begin until eight days or an Octave before Christmas, even though as many as twelve O's might be assigned to the Office of that preparatory week. Thus the Antiphonary of

---

[32] P. xxxix f., note 6.

[33] Pp. 81, 100, 103, and *passim.*

[34] Thus, according to Green (*Archæologia,* xlix. 221), the singing of the Greater Antiphons began as early as December 13 at Cividale del Friuli, Aquileia, Siena, Liège, Salzburg, Ratisbon, Bamberg, Augsburg, Constance, and Freising. To this list Grotefend (*Zeitrechnung,* i. 140) adds Cammin and Gnesen.

Hartker,[35] which has twelve Greater Antiphons, puts them all in the last week preceding the feast of the Nativity: *In proxima Ebdomada Nat. Dni. ad Uesp.* This would leave room only for the seven Universal O's as Antiphons of the *Magnificat.* We must conclude from this that the Added or Monastic O's were used extensively for purposes other than the Antiphons proper of the *Magnificat* in Vespers, that they must have found a place outside the strictly liturgical Office as Antiphons for special services or occasions.

Indeed, the Antiphonary of Hartker itself gives us a clue to the practices surrounding the use of the Added O's in the mediæval Church. On page 57 above we have reproduced several directions found in this Antiphonary and relating to the Antiphons *O Hierusalem, O mundi Domina,* and *O Virgo virginum.* In each case it will be seen that they were used for a service other than that indicated for the seven Universal O's, being assigned to the service following the *Magnificat* and its regular appointed Antiphon. This service is here referred to as *ad crucem.* As a rule, the seven Universal O's were not assigned to this service.[36] On the other hand, the Added O's were plainly suited for this purpose. In fact, it is quite possible that they have originated in the service designated *ad crucem.* But before we proceed in our discussion, a word of explanation regarding the rubric *ad crucem* is necessary.

The rubric *ad crucem* in the Antiphonary of Hartker refers to the commemorations made in Lauds after the *Benedictus,* and in Vespers after the *Magnificat.* In the English use these Antiphons with accompanying prayers are called "memorials," and

[35] P. 40.—Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year,* "Advent," pp. 508-531, arranges twelve O-Antiphons for the last week preceding Christmas. But in his distribution of these Antiphons he merely inserts the Added O's in their regular order between the seven Universal O's, yet forgets the *O mundi Domina* in his scheme. His arrangement is not intended as a definitely established one, serving merely the purpose of a devotional treatise. He himself says (page 514) that details belonging strictly to the archæology of Liturgy do not enter into the plan of his work.

[36] Green (*Archæologia,* xlix, 227), in a note, refers to Thomasius's *Psalterium cum Canticis,* ed. Blanchinius, i, 518-521, where the seven Universal O's are said to be incorporated into the "Preces ad adorandam Crucem" of a MS. in the Vatican. The heading there is said to be: "Incipiunt Orationes ad Adorandam Crucem; sive ad deposcenda suffragia omnium Sanctorum." This MS., in the opinion of Edmund Bishop, was written in the great Benedictine Abbey of Reichenau, on the Lake of Constance. Apparently, this is the only instance in which even the seven Universal O's are assigned to the service *ad crucem.*

they were always chanted after the regular Antiphon and Prayer of the day or feast. The memorials were sometimes called *suffragia omnium sanctorum,* as appears from the reference in the Vatican manuscript quoted above, or simply *suffragia.* In the present Roman Breviary they are called *commemorationes communes,* or *commemoratio de cruce.* The term *ad crucem,* and also *de cruce,* is derived from the fact that a memorial of the Holy Cross usually preceded the other memorials in honor of Mary, the Apostles, the Patron of the particular church, and for the peace of the universal Church. In the Easter time, the period from Easter Sunday to Trinity Sunday, this memorial of the Cross alone is made in the Office as we have it today. Apparently it was also the custom in some mediæval churches to perform these memorials before an image of the Cross, whither those attending the choir proceeded after the Prayer of the day. This practice is indicated in the *Ordo* of Bernard of Cluny,[37] as follows:

> Commemoratio s. Crucis tunc (sc. in Adventu) dimittitur * * * unde et post Vesperos regulares non ad sanctam Crucem, sed ad sanctam Mariam processio agitur, ad quam R. "Ave Maria" cantatur, et post Matutinum R. "Ecce Virgo." * * * sicut per totum Adventum.

But even if, as here directed, the ordinary commemoration of the Cross was omitted in the Advent time, and a special memorial in honor of the Virgin Mary taken in its stead, the term *ad crucem* was still retained for this service in some of the codices. A witness to this is the Antiphonary of Hartker as quoted above.

Yet, even in the Antiphonary of Hartker, there seem to be no memorials during the Advent season, that is, before the Vigil of Christmas. In this respect customs must have differed widely.

The Antiphonary of Lucca adds, after the Antiphons *in Evangelio* on the first Sunday of Advent, an Antiphon *ad honorem S. Mariae.* The editor of this Antiphonary,[38] in the Introduction to the photographic facsimile, declares that the Antiphon *ad honorem S. Mariae* must evidently have served for the whole of Advent. In this connection he calls attention to the Roman Antiphonary of St. Peter's[39] and to the *Ordo Romanus XI,*[40]

[37] *Ordo Cluniac.,* ed. Hergott; pars ii. cap. i. 283.—cf. also *Consuetudines Farfenses,* ed. B. Albers, 1900; Paléogr. Musicale, ix. 23.
[38] In *Paléographie Musicale,* ix. Intro. 23.
[39] In Tommasi, *Opera Omnia,* iv. 22.
[40] Ed. Migne, P. L., 78, 1028.

which both have a commemoration of the same kind, but for the ferial or weekdays of Advent only.

In some places, however, the usual memorials seem to have been retained even during the season of Advent, and even during the period in which the O-Antiphons were chanted. Archbishop John of Rouen (eleventh century) gives the custom of the Church of the Canons Regular of St. Laud at Rouen thus: [41]

> Nonnulli postquam has antiphonas incœperint, prostrationes et preces in Vesperis dimittunt; a nobis vero non dimittuntur, sed solitum cursum exsequimur.

In the directions for the Cathedral Church of Rouen, the same author is more explicit when he says: [42]

> Nono die nativitatem Domini praecedenti cantari incipiantur antiphonae quae per "O" inchoant, quas preces non subsequantur, non tamen commemorationes dimittantur.

It appears from all this that the memorial service was not a universally established part of the Divine Office for the Advent season, and wherever they were admitted to the Advent Office as usual, allowances must still be made for the manner in which they were performed. A memorial in honor of the Virgin Mary seems to have been most prevalent. But the one thing which draws our interest most to these services termed *ad crucem, commemorationes,* or *in honorem S. Mariae,* is the fact that the Added O's found their employment in this part of the Divine Office. Hence, in endeavoring to understand the positions of these Added O's in *Christ I,* we must allow for an individual use of the Antiphons in question by the church service which Cynewulf is supposed to have followed. Whatever that use may have been cannot be determined with accuracy; yet it is plain that the Added O's were more liable to shifting and to individual re-arrangement than even the seven Universal O's. And if, consequently, we find them in a certain order in *Christ I,* the poet need not necessarily have chosen such an order himself. He may well have followed merely the particular order in which he was acquainted with them.

---

[41] Joannis Archiep. Rothomagensis *Ordinarium,* in Migne, P. L., 147, 159.

[42] Joannis Archiep. Rothomagensis *Fragmenta Quaedam,* Migne, P. L., 147, 123.

The four Added or Monastic O's employed by Cynewulf in *Christ I* are: *O Hierusalem, O Virgo virginum, O Rex Pacifice.* and *O mundi Domina.* Some customs surrounding these O's individually may be noted in order to shed additional light upon the possible order in which they were employed in the mediæval Church.

(1) The Added Antiphon *O Hierusalem* appears to be a purely monastic "O," for it is found only where the complete set of twelve Greater Antiphons was used. It is contained in the tenth century manuscript of St. Gall, the Antiphonary of Hartker and, according to Green,[43] also in the *Codices Forojulienses.* In the Antiphonary of Hartker it is restricted to the service *ad crucem,* being assigned therein to the Vigil of the Nativity. It is the only mention of the *O Hierusalem* made in this Antiphonary; it is the only rubric which I could find anywhere relating to this Antiphon.

In connection with the Antiphon *O Hierusalem* it might be well to recall that one of the Advent Sundays, usually the second,[44] was devoted particularly to the praise of Jerusalem, the holy city of God's chosen people. This may have led to the singing on this Sunday, or on some other day in Advent, of a separate Great Antiphon to the *civitas Dei summi.* The use of this Added O is therefore indefinite and was undoubtedly a matter of individual choice.

(2) The Antiphon *O Virgo virginum* is the earliest of the Added O's. St. Gregory the Great gives it the eighth place among the Advent O's in his *Liber Responsalis.*[45] This place it has with few exceptions kept wherever it was included in the list of Greater Antiphons.[46] Amalarius[47] treats of it and calls

[43] *Archæologia,* xlix, 225.—Green quotes De Rubeis, *Dissertationes Duae,* Venice, 1754, p. 453.

[44] In the Antiphonary of Hartker (pp. 21-23) the Office of the third Advent Sunday celebrates the city of Jerusalem.—cf. also Cook, pp. xxxiii f.

[45] When therefore Green (*Archæologia,* xlix, 224) says that "at Rome, the *O Virgo virginum* does not seem to have found a place in her antiphonary until after 1286, as Durandus makes no mention of it," he places an erroneous deduction from the omission of Durandus above the evidence of the *Liber Responsalis.*

[46] Of this Antiphon Grotefend (*Zeitrechnung,* i. 140) says: "Häufiger gesellte sich ihnen (d.h., den sieben Antiphonen), theils am Anfang (so in Besançon), theils am 18. (so in Spanien am Feste der "Annunciatio Marie de la O"), theils am Schluss (so in Schwerin) die Antiphone *O Virgo virginum* zu."

[47] In Migne, P. L., 105, 1269.

it an "added" O. Of the widespread use of this Antiphon we have spoken above. The manner in which it was used is perhaps the most varied of any connected with the Added O's.

In the beginning the *O Virgo virginum* was probably used as a regular Great "O" of Advent, taking the last place of these and thus falling either on the Vigil of Christmas itself (December 24) or on the "super-vigil" (December 23). But later it was used for the feast of the Annunciation on March 25, as attested by the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo of the twelfth century.[48] From this feast it was then naturally transferred to the feast of the *Expectatio Partus* or *Commemoratio de la O* of December 18. Yet the early Antiphonaries do not have the *O Virgo virginum* for the feast of the Annunciation,[49] and the feast of the Expectation was then as yet absent from the kalendar of the Church. At that early time the *O Virgo virginum* was apparently limited to the "commemoration" of the Virgin Mary in the Advent Office, or to the memorials. In the Antiphonary of Hartker it is placed as a memorial Antiphon in the Vespers of the feast of the Holy Innocents (December 28), and this is the only disposition made of it in this Antiphonary.

Another use of the *O Virgo virginum* is pointed out by Green. He informs us [50] that, in the Dominican Breviary, this Antiphon occurs in the *Officium Parvum* and in the Saturday Votive Office of the Blessed Virgin for the whole season of Advent. In the Roman and Benedictine Breviaries of today this Antiphon does not appear in this service, nor do we find it in the "Horae Beatae Mariae Virginis secundum Usum Sarum," or the English "Prymer." [51]

Grancolas [52] puts the *O Virgo virginum* in the Office of December 23, and mentions these ceremonies connected with its chanting:

[48] P. 348.—cf. also the *York Breviary*, ed. Lawley, ii. 243.

[49] The *O Virgo virginum* is not contained in the Mozarabic Rite for December 18 (see Migne, P. L., 86, 1290), nor is it found in the "Proprium Ss. Tolet. Eccl." of 1819. For this information I am indebted to Rev. F. G. Holweck, who is of the opinion that the Antiphon is not of Spanish but of Frankish origin. If the twelfth century MS. of Toledo (Paléogr. Musicale, vol. ix) contains this Antiphon, it must be remembered that this Antiphonary of Toledo is of Italian origin and identical with that of Lucca.

[50] *Archæologia*, xlix, 225, note.

[51] Cf. Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, vol. ii.

[52] *Commentarius historicus in Breviarium Romanum*, Venice, 1734, lib. ii. cap. xii.

In pluribus Ecclesiis Natalis supervigilio, scilicet 23 Decembris, Vesperae solemnes erant propter Antiphonam "O Virgo virginum." Campanae praeterea omnes pulsabantur, albae vestes, et incensum adhibebantur.

Whatever the various uses connected with the Antiphon *O Virgo virginum* may have been in the course of centuries, at the time of Cynewulf it seems to have been restricted to its regular place among the Advent O's, being in many cases sung on December 23.[53] Yet, that the service *ad crucem* had already at an early time claimed a special place for this Antiphon is borne out by the Antiphonary of Hartker which, it must again be recalled, is the earliest known Antiphonary containing all the O-Antiphons employed in *Christ I.* Since in those days the *O Virgo virginum* was not attached to any special feast, as the Annunciation or the Expectation, a greater freedom in its use was but natural. In the particular use with which Cynewulf was acquainted, it may have well been chanted on any day preceding or immediately following Christmas day as the Antiphon for a memorial.

(3) The Antiphon *O Rex Pacifice* is as obscure as the *O Hierusalem,* or even more so. It was apparently likewise restricted to purely monastic use. The Antiphonary of Hartker, in which it takes the tenth place in the list of Advent O's, makes no further mention of it, and still the general directions given therein imply that all the Greater Antiphons were to be sung within the last week of Advent.[54] This makes it necessary for the *O Rex Pacifice* to find its place somewhere as an additional "O," as for instance in the memorial service *ad crucem.*

The address of the Antiphon would seem to point to its use in the first Vespers of Christmas (December 24), or in a special service connected with these Vespers. The Antiphonary assigns the following Antiphons to the Vesper service on Christmas Eve:[55]

[53] Cook (p. 84) assigns the *O Virgo virginum* to December 24, but he nowhere shows an instance in which it was used on that day (cf. p. xxxix).

[54] The first reference in the Antiphonary of Hartker relating to the Greater Antiphons is the rubric on page 31, *Ant. O Sap. vel de illis sicut evenerit* for the *Magnificat* of the Saturday preceding the last Sunday before Christmas. The Antiphons are thus placed within the last week of Advent.

[55] Antiphonary of Hartker, pp. 43 f.—cf. The Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo, p. 31.

Ant. Scitote quia prope est *regnum dei,* amen dico vobis quia non tardabit. (first Antiphon).

Ant. Rex pacificus magnificatus est cuius vultum desiderat universa terra (second Antiphon).

Ant. Magnificatus est *rex pacificus* super omnes reges universae terrae (third Antiphon).

Ant. Dum ortus fuerit sol de coelo videbitis *regem regum* procedentem a matre (sic!) tanquam sponsum de thalamo suo. (the Antiphon for the Magnificat).

In this Vesper service, it will be seen, Christ is glorified in a special manner as the King of Peace, two Antiphons being devoted to this title alone. Another Antiphon speaks of the kingdom of God, while the Antiphon for the *Magnificat* pictures Him as the King of Kings, proceeding in his temporal birth from the hallowed womb of his Virgin Mother.

It is therefore not improbable that the Antiphon *O Rex Pacifice* was used in the service *ad crucem* following the solemn Vespers on December 24, or some other time on the Vigil of Christmas, as the peculiar custom may have determined.

(4) The last Added "O" employed by Cynewulf is the *O mundi Domina.* In Hartker's Antiphonary [56] this Antiphon is assigned to the service *ad crucem* for the Vespers of Christmas day. In other uses it was chanted on the Vigil, or Christmas Eve. Thus the Leofric Collectar [57] makes it the Antiphon proper of the *Magnificat* on the Vigil of the Nativity. But it was also used on this day outside the Office of the Vespers. This is shown by the following information gathered by Green [58] in his paper on the O-Antiphons:

> As regards the *O mundi Domina,* which was sung on Christmas Eve, called in most Celtic languages the "Night of Mary," [59] the old rubric at Cividale del Friuli in Italy is as follows: "Exeat Sacerdos paratus de Sacristia, cantantibus pueris, et ascendat ad imperium, et cantet Evangelium, scilicet "Liber Generationis." Completo Evangelio dicitur antiph. "O mundi Domina." Finita ant. dicitur statim "Te Deum laudamus." [60] This was also the custom at the Benedictine Abbeys of S. Germain des Prés, S. Vandrille or Fontenelle, and S. Pierre-sur-Dive.[61] In place, however, of

[56] P. 52.
[57] Fol. 11ª.
[58] *Archæologia,* xlix, 226 f.
[59] Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology,* 1867, p. 511.
[60] De Rubeis, *Dissertationes Duae,* Venice, 1754, p. 478.
[61] Martène, *De Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus,* lib. ii. cap. iv. paragr. v.

the "O mundi Domina," the antiphon at Bec, Lyre, Cluny, and Corbie, and from the days of Lanfranc at Canterbury, and by all those "qui statuta Lanfranci tenebant," was "O Beata Infantia." [62]

From all that has been said of the Antiphon *O mundi Domina* it appears that this, the last of the O's, found its use in the immediate preparation for the feast of Christmas. The ceremonial followed at Cividale del Friuli, at S. Germain des Prés, at Fontenelle and S. Pierre-sur-Dive, places it in a special service connected with the solemn Matins of Christmas. This custom must have been more prevalent than indicated by liturgical writers, perhaps even spreading over to England and becoming established here and there before the time of Lanfranc (1089).

From the records we have of these Added or Monastic O's employed by Cynewulf, therefore, it is apparent that they were used in various ways by the different churches of mediæval Christianity. The outstanding fact is that they are additional O's, and the various uses show that they were always employed as such, with the exception perhaps of the *O Virgo virginum*. Being chanted in various services not strictly liturgical, and on special occasions, local variations in their use were even more marked than in the matter of the seven Universal O's.

But here again, as in the case of the seven Universal O's, we observe only one displacement of the regular order in Cynewulf's poem. Since the Added O's employed in *Christ I* are first found in the Antiphonary of Hartker of the tenth century, a comparison of their order of succession in that Antiphonary with the order maintained in *Christ I* is not out of place:

Antiphonary of Hartker.	*Christ I.*
1. O Virgo virginum (O Gabriel)	1. O Hierusalem
2. O Rex Pacifice	2. O Virgo virginum
3. O mundi Domina	3. O Rex Pacifice
4. O Hierusalem	4. O mundi Domina.

By omitting the *O Gabriel* (which is not found in the preserved portion of *Christ I*), it is apparent that Cynewulf allowed only one change in the position of his Added O's. The *O Hierusalem*, instead of appearing last, is taken first. Again, as in the case

[62] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 331.—The quotations are all Green's.

of the seven Universal O's, it is here possible that the poet knew and used an Antiphonary with the *O Hierusalem* in the first place; or he used the usual Monastic Antiphonary known to us, with a slight variant application in his particular church.

4. The Remaining Sources

Of the twelve divisions in *Christ I* four are not based upon any of the Greater Antiphons of Advent as we know them today. They are Divisions VII, X, XI, and XII. Division VII contains the dialogue between Mary and Joseph and is commonly referred to as the *Passus I* of the *Christ,* or simply the *Passus* when speaking of *Christ I.* Division X is, as we have seen in discussing its possible source, either based upon an unknown Greater Antiphon (which can hardly be assumed), or must be looked upon as forming the poet's own final O-paraphrase. Division XI is the Doxology. Division XII is based upon an Antiphon of the Christmas Octave, the *O Admirabile commercium.* The sources of these four divisions will here be considered with a view to establishing the precise time at which they followed in the celebration of the Divine Office, or in other liturgical functions.

(1) The *Passus* or dialogue between Mary and Joseph was seen to hold a unique place in *Christ I.* Not only is the source for it foreign to the Greater Antiphons, but the whole construction of the division forming it is different from that of the other divisions preceding the Doxology. The direct and immediate source upon which the poet may have relied for the construction of this dialogue is not known to investigators at the present time. Yet, in its general theme, the *Passus* undoubtedly belongs to the Vigil of Christmas. The Gospel extract of that day, Matth. i. 18-21, is the ultimate source of the dialogue in *Christ I,* for it treats exclusively of the perplexities which confronted St. Joseph when he found Mary to be with child. It was shown above that even the Antiphonary contains allusions to this Gospel theme. It is moreover possible that, through the Office in use in his day and country, Cynewulf was acquainted with one or the other of the five Homilies from the Fathers [63] which treat the Gospel extract of the Vigil in the very form of a dialogue similar

[63] Cook, "A Remote Analogue to the Miracle Play," in *Journal of Germanic Philology,* iv. 421-451.

to that of *Christ I.* If these homilies were unknown to the poet, a later compilation of them may have furnished the source for the *Passus.*

In Church use, therefore, the source of Division VII belongs to the Office chanted on the Vigil of Christmas (December 24), more definitely to the Matins, or possibly Lauds, of that day.

(2) Although the direct source for *Division X* has hitherto been unknown, I believe this to be found in the Preface sung in the midnight Mass of Christmas. The first part or address of this division treats specifically of the eternal generation of the Son from the Father. This is the exclusive theme of the Preface in question. Moreover, the close connection of Division X with the Doxology immediately following it confirms the theory which accepts the Christmas Preface as its source. Although the second part or the petition of this division does not seem to treat exclusively a theme distinctly connected with the feast of Christmas, the central thought underlying it, the captivity of the soul, is found in the Prayer used in the third Mass and throughout the Divine Office of Christmas day. It must be remembered that the petition in Cynewulf's paraphrases is commonly built upon his own personal reflections and often does not give a clear indication of the principal source employed in the respective portion of the poem. The place which Division X holds in the Church use is, however, plainly that of Christmas day itself.

(3) The *Doxology,* or Division XI, in its first portion (lines 378-402, is based upon two Antiphons to the Holy Trinity, except perhaps lines 385-402 which can be looked upon as an expansion of the *omnes creaturae tuae* of the second Antiphon. It was but natural for the poet to turn to the Office of the Holy Trinity for the sources of his Doxology, no matter how far removed this Office may have been from the Christmas Office in the Antiphonary. Yet, in the days of Cynewulf there was no special feast of the Holy Trinity as we have it today.

As a matter of fact, the feast of the Trinity was not extended to the whole Church until the pontificate of Pope John XXII (1316-1334), although it had been observed in local churches before that time. Bishop Stephen of Liège (903-920) composed an Office of the Holy Trinity, and the Micrologies[64] written

[64] Migne, P. L., 151, 1020.

during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-1085) refer to this Office of Bishop Stephen, though they themselves have no feast in honor of the Trinity.[65] Still, even in the early Church, canticles, responses, a Preface and hymns were being recited on the Sundays of the year in honor of the Blessed Trinity from the time when the Arian heresy began to spread. Such prayers and a Preface are found in the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great,[66] and must have spread to England soon after Gregory's time, if not with St. Augustine himself. It is not said that the Office composed by Bishop Stephen of Liège was the first of its kind in use.

The Antiphonary of Hartker [67] has an Office after the Sundays and ferias *post Theophaniam,* and it is there called *Ystoria de sca. Trinitate.* The two Antiphons used by Cynewulf are contained in this Office, being the first and fifth Antiphon respectively of Lauds.[68] The Leofric Collectar [69] likewise has the two Antiphons used by Cynewulf. In it they are assigned to the Sundays after the feast of the Epiphany, being used for Prime and None respectively.

Cynewulf therefore found the sources for the first half of the Doxology much nearer to the Christmas Office than they are in the Breviary used today. He did not need to turn many leaves to find them.

The second half of the Doxology (lines 403-415) was seen to be a faithful transcription of the Angelic hymn *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus* which, in the Mass, follows the Preface and is introduced by it. In Church use this part of the Doxology consequently belongs to the same Preface upon which the preceding division (Division X) is based.

(4) The final division, *Division XII,* of *Christ I* is based upon the Antiphon *O admirabile commercium.* This is not an Advent "O," and as such would have been out of place after the Doxology. It is the outstanding Antiphons in the Office of the Octave of the Nativity, now commonly called the feast of the Circumcision. In this place we find it in the Antiphonary of Hartker, in the

[65] Cf. *Catholic Encyclopædia,* xv. 58.
[66] Migne, P. L., 78, 116.
[67] Pp. 101-105.
[68] P. 104.
[69] Folia 32^{b}-33^{a}.

Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo, in the Leofric Collectar, and many others. In later times, the use of the *O admirabile commercium* was extended to the feast of the Purification on February 2, as well as to the Saturday Votive Office and the *Officium Parvum* (or "Horae," "Book of Hours," "English Prymer") of the Blessed Virgin.[70]

Division XII of *Christ I* accordingly represents in Church use the Octave of Christmas and, as being a paraphrase of the principal Antiphon of that Octave, it might well be considered a later addition to the poem. This does not mean that Cynewulf did not himself compose this portion of *Christ I,* but some time must have intervened between its composition and the writing of the last lines of the Doxology. Since lines 416-439 do not fit well into the scheme of *Christ I,* and since their source is removed by one week from the sources of the other O-paraphrases, a theory of this kind does not seem altogether wanting in evidence. Yet, with the *O admirabile commercium* as its basis, this final paraphrase, even if a later addition, fittingly closes the great theme carried out in Part I of Cynewulf's *Christ,* for it is with the Octave of Christmas to which the source belongs, that the Christmas Office finds its close.

The foregoing outline of the sources of *Christ I* as found in actual Church use was necessarily limited to those practices in the mediæval Church which promised to give a better understanding of the order of succession taken by these sources in the Divine Office of that time. A comprehensive survey of those sources was not attempted and did not come within the purview of my study.

It was found that a proper estimate of the sources employed by Cynewulf requires a detachment from the verbal setting of these sources in the Church books, and a corresponding regard for their liturgical setting in the actual chanting of the Divine Office. Mindful of the wide liberties enjoyed in liturgical matters by the Church of the early Middle Ages, and of the adaptability of the conventional list of Advent O's to the practices and

[70] Thus in the "English Prymer" ("Horae Beatae Mariae Virginis secundum usum Sarum," ca. 1410), the Antiphon for Lauds and Prime is: "O the wondirful marchaundise (or: exchaunge), the maker of mankynde takynge a bodi with a soule of a maide, fouchide saaf to be born, and so goyn forth man withoute seed gaf to us his godhede."—cf. Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia,* ii. 15, 23, 44.

"consuetudines" of the individual churches, the single dislocation which Cynewulf allows both in the seven Universal O's and in the Added or Monastic O's can be readily accounted for by the particular Church use which he may have known and followed. Indeed, the slightly changed order of O-Antiphons in *Christ I* might even be considered proof of the existence of an Antiphonary containing the same order of Greater Antiphons.

The material of the *Passus* was seen to belong specifically to the Vigil of Christmas. The sources of the divisions following the dialogue progress with the Divine Office from the Matins of the Vigil to the Octave of Christmas. The *O Rex Pacifice* falls to the Vesper service of Christmas Eve, the *O mundi Domina* to the celebration of the solemn Christmas Matins, the Preface of Division X to the midnight-Mass immediately following the chanting of Matins. The Doxology appears as the conclusion of the preceding Preface as well as of the great poetic hymn of O's in praise of the coming of Christ to mankind. The appended paraphrase of the *O admirabile commercium* represents the Octave of Christmas which closes the narrower celebration of Christ's Nativity.

The result of this study of the sources of *Christ I* should throw some light upon the plan or outline maintained in the poem. We can therefore proceed to bring these sources as found in actual Church use into relation with the twelve divisions of *Christ I.*

IV

CONCLUSION

1. The Dependence of Christ I upon the Antiphonary

In the preliminary to this study we have seen that the manuscript divisions of *Christ I,* which have latterly been largely disregarded, retain their significance in regard to the construction of the poem. In the new valuation given them above they support a theory of structural unity which I have called the *hymnic unity,* since the whole of *Christ I,* with the exception of the *Passus* and of the last section, bears a striking analogy to the structure of some of the most common Church hymns. If the theory of structural unity is thus given secure probability, this probability, in the later discussion of the sources of *Christ I,* is raised to what seems to me almost a certainty. My review of the sources of *Christ I* as found in actual Church use, moreover, proves that the poet's method of securing structural unity was one of close adherence to the sourcebooks from which he drew his material, provided this material is not taken from its proper setting in the Divine Office of the Church. For, if the material upon which the twelve divisions are based is collated with that part of the Advent and Christmas Office from which it is taken, the order of sequence found in *Christ I* will be seen to conform closely to the service of the mediæval Church as Cynewulf is most likely to have known it.

In order to facilitate a summary survey of the whole subject as outlined in this study, the following table is appended:

	Based on Universal O.	*Based on Added O.*	*Based on Other Sources.*	*The Sources in Church Use.*
	– O Sapientia (I)			The week before
A.	– O Adonai (II)			Christmas.
	– O Radix (III)			"
	I O Rex gentium (VI)			"
B.	II O Clavis (IV)			"
	III	O Hierusalem (4)		"
	IV	O Virgo virg. (1)		"
C.	V O Oriens (V)			"
	VI O Emmanuel (VII)			December 23.

D.[1]	VII	(The Passus)	Matth.i.18-21	Vigil, Matins.
	VIII	O Rex Pacifice (2)		Dec. 24, Vespers.
D.[2]	IX	O mundi Domina (3)		Christmas Matins.
	X	(Unknown, Poet's own)	Preface	Midnight Mass.
E.[1]	XI	(Doxology)	Trinity Ant. Sanctus.	Sunday Office. Mass.
E.[2]	XII	O adm. Commercium		Octave of Christmas.

The Roman numerals from I to XII in the second column represent the source-divisions in *Christ I,* based either upon an Advent "O" (Universal or Added), or upon some other source indicated. The last column gives the succession of the sources in the Divine Office and service of the Church.

The one-line spaces in the manuscript mark off the smaller divisions into the groups B, C, D, and E. I have placed the *Passus,* as well as the last section into a separate subdivided group, because their status in the poem is not quite clear and they actually mar the symmetrical proportions otherwise maintained in *Christ I.*

Group A represents what I conceive to have been the content of the lost portion of the *Christ* at the beginning of the manuscript. It was shown that the three Greater Antiphons placed there must be accounted for, since no other portion of the poem treats them commensurately with their importance and position in the Antiphonary.

Groups B and C represent in the liturgy the week before Christmas, in which the Greater Antiphons of Advent were being chanted. With the supposition of group A, all seven Universal O's are thus accounted for in *Christ I,* in an order, it is true, slightly different from that found in most of the Antiphonaries that have come down to us, but not unlike that of the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo of the twelfth century. With regard to the insertion of two Added O's in Groups B and C, it was pointed out that the customs surrounding the chanting of the Added or Monastic O's in the mediæval Church would sanction this procedure on the part of the poet. Being used for the "memorials" or the service *ad crucem,* these additional O's had no fixed place in actual Church use, though they commonly followed a conventional order in the list of Advent O's. Besides,

Cynewulf allowed only a slight change of even the conventional order, by merely taking the *O Hierusalem* first instead of last.

The Roman numerals after the seven Universal O's show their enumeration in the Antiphonary of Hartker. In like manner the Arabic numerals after the Added O's. It is apparent that only No. VI of the former, and No. 4 of the latter are disarranged in *Christ I.*

Group D^1, or the *Passus,* marks a larger division in the content of the poem. The several Universal O's have now all been paraphrased. The Vigil of Christmas is at hand, and the Gospel extract read on that Vigil forms the ultimate source for the dialogue contained in this division. Henceforth the poetic paraphrases become more elaborate (Divisions VIII and IX being the longest in *Christ I,* with 61 and 73 lines respectively), the interpolations of extraneous or at least not closely connected material become more extensive (in Division VIII the account of the creation of light in lines 224-235; in Division IX the vision of Ezekiel in lines 301-334), and the longing for the Redeemer is more intense. All this is in keeping with the spirit of the Church displayed in her Office of the Vigil of the Nativity. If the *Passus* should be by a later hand, the proper place which, according to its theme, it should occupy in the poem was rightly felt, and in this respect it does not mar the sequence of subjects in *Christ I.*

Group D^2 represents the Christmas Office: Division VIII being taken from the first Vespers of the Nativity on December 24 or from a special service connected with these Vespers, Division IX, from the *O mundi Domina* service following the solemn chanting of Matins on the Eve of Christmas and itself immediately followed by the midnight-Mass, and Division X, from the Preface of that midnight-Mass of Christmas, thus leading to the theme of the Doxology which follows in the poem.

Group E^1 constitutes the Doxology and probably was at first designed to mark the completion of the O-paraphrases. The material for this Doxology is not taken from the Advent Antiphonary. Yet it was seen that the sources of it lay much nearer to the Christmas Office in the days of Cynewulf than in our own day. The sources for the first half, the two Trinity Antiphons, are found in the common Sunday Office, while the source for the

second half, the Angelic hymn *Sanctus,* is even more immediate in its sequence upon the Preface of the Mass which forms the basis for the preceding division.

Group E^2 finally represents the Octave of Christmas which is the completion of the Christmas festival proper, though the entire Christmas season extends to the feast of the Purification on February 2. From the nature of the source upon which it is based, this closing section of *Christ I* might be considered a later appendage to the poem, so that Cynewulf may be credited with its composition at the time when the Octave of Christmas was actually being celebrated.

With a disposition of the material in *Christ I* as seen here, the absolute arbitrariness of the poet in arranging his subjects seems reduced to a mere fantasy. *There is method, there is coherence, there is unity,* a unity not merely of mood but of structure. If the progression of subjects presented in the twelve divisions of *Christ I* is not dependent upon logic nor upon an orderly development of thought, the fault lies with the source-books employed, and not with the poet. Indeed, the character of the sources determines the unity of the poem, but it is not merely a lyrical unity which the sources determine. It is a unity of plan or external construction evident in the close adherence of the poet to the order in which his sources appear in the Church use.

From the manner in which Cynewulf follows the Church use in arranging the material of *Christ I* it appears that his inspiration for the successive paraphrases was not derived so much from the service books themselves as from an actual attendance at the Divine Office. In other words, the sources of *Christ I* must not be taken out of their proper environment, that is, from their liturgical setting in the actual chanting of the Divine Office; for only in that essential atmosphere do they receive that life and that spirit which warmed the emotions and stimulated the power of song in Cynewulf. Only in that life which they live in the liturgy of the Church can their true influence upon the structural plan of *Christ I* be measured.

While thus the Antiphonary as a book would be excluded as the immediate source of inspiration for the poet, it nevertheless constitutes for the practical purposes of study and investigation the chief sourcebook for Part I of the *Christ.* With the excep-

tion of Divisions VII and X, the smaller divisions of *Christ I* are all based on material contained in the Antiphonary. Consequently the result of my investigation affects in a special manner this chief source-book of Cynewulf. And it affects in particular the question, in what relation does *Christ I* structurally stand to the Antiphonary?

From all that has been said it seems to follow that the structural relation of *Christ I* to the Antiphonary is one of almost complete dependence. With a proper interpretation of the liturgical practices followed by the mediæval Church, the slight disarrangement in the seven Universal O's as well as in the Added O's apparent in *Christ I* does not destroy the conclusion thus arrived at. Nor does the insertion of two Added O's between the seven Universal O's, as Divisions III and IV disclose, militate against the theory of the poet's dependence upon the Antiphonary for the order in which he places his themes. In these smaller adjustments of his material, the poet must be conceived as merely following an individually adapted Antiphonary of his own church.

In fact, a reconstructed Antiphonary on the plan of *Christ I* could not be considered as presenting an unaccustomed anomaly. If Cynewulf had known and used a book of this kind, the list of Greater Antiphons appearing in it would compare with that of Hartker's Antiphonary and the Antiphonaries of Lucca and Toledo in the following manner:

Hartker (St. Gall MS)	*Cynewulf.*	*Lucca & Toledo.*
O Sapientia	O Sapientia	O Sapientia
O Adonai	O Adonai	O Adonai
O Radix Jesse	O Radix Jesse	O Radix Jesse
	O Rex gentium	
O Clavis David	O Clavis David	O Clavis David
O Oriens	O Oriens	
O Rex gentium		O Rex gentium
O Emmanuel	O Emmanuel	O Emmanuel
	O Hierusalem	O Oriens
O Virgo virginum	O Virgo virginum	
O Gabriel	(O Gabriel?)	
O Rex Pacifice	O Rex Pacifice	
O mundi Domina	O mundi Domina	
O Hierusalem		

Indeed, a *Cynewulf-Antiphonary* seems plausible enough. The very order which Cynewulf maintains in his sources in *Christ I* might argue in favor of such an Antiphonary, though its existence is unknown to us. If, however, the poet followed the Antiphonary in use at St. Gall and preserved for us in the rich library of that monastery, local adaptations prevailing in the monasteries of England will have to account for the slight differences which exist in the arrangement of material in *Christ I* as compared with the St. Gall manuscript.

The plan or outline, therefore, which Cynewulf followed in the construction of *Christ I* is derived from the Antiphonary correctly interpreted for all the paraphrases of the poem based on antiphonal matter. The dependence of the poet upon this source-book is consequently not confined to the material taken therefrom, but extends to the very arrangement or sequence of the smaller divisions based on that material. It is a dependence which furnishes the unifying element in the poem. Yes, Cynewulf is mindful and careful of the "architectonics and the perspective" of the whole; he does show his "ability to view the smaller scenes as related parts of a larger whole," and this ability is the fruit of his dependence upon the Antiphonary.

2. Corollary "A"

Further Dependence upon the Antiphonary

For the purpose of this investigation, viz., to determine Cynewulf's dependence upon the Antiphonary in the construction of *Christ I,* that antiphonal matter alone was considered which forms the basis for the individual paraphrases as such. Yet, from the very dependence of the poet upon the Antiphonary for the succession of his themes, as pointed out in my study, the inference of a further dependence upon that very source-book easily suggests itself. It is true, Cynewulf introduces into the smaller divisions of *Christ I* a large amount of material derived from other service books used in the Divine Office. Still, I believe, the full influence of the Antiphonary itself even upon the subsidiary material of the paraphrases, as standing apart from the material furnished by the Greater Antiphons, has not been adequately determined.

Though the subject is well worth the effort of more extended

research, a few suggestions relating to this further influence of the Antiphonary in *Christ I* may not be out of place.

To line 2ᵇ ff.—Cook (p. 73) refers for the thoughts here developed to Psalm 118. 22 (in the Vulgate text, Psalm 117. 22). This is undoubtedly the ultimate source of the passage, and even as such was surely known to Cynewulf through the chanting of the Psalms in the Office. Still the Antiphonary brings this verse of Psalm 118 in direct connection with the coming Savior in the Christmas Office. Wherefore Cynewulf would seem to have relied more immediately for this text upon the Antiphonary. A Response in the Office for Christmas day is:[1]

> Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini, Deus Dominus et illuxit nobis. V. Lapidem quem reprobaverunt aedificantes, hic factus est in caput anguli. A Domino factum est istud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris.

To line 109: God of Gode.—Cook says in his Notes (p. 91): "This can only come from the Nicene Creed." An Antiphon for Christmas day is as follows:[2]

> Natus est nobis deus de deo, lumen de lumine, quod erat in principio.

To lines 130 ff.—The division based on the Great Antiphon of Advent, *O Emmanuel,* begins as follows:

> Ealā gæsta God, hū þū glēawlīce
> mid noman ryhte nemned wǣre
> Emmānūhēl, swā hit engel gecwæð
> ǣrest on Ebrēsc; (lines 130-133ᵃ)

Cynewulf here confuses the angel with the prophet Isaias, for it was not the former but the latter who first announced in the Hebrew tongue the name to be given to the coming Redeemer as that of "Emmanuel" (Is. vii. 14). The only name given by the angel to the Son of God was that of "Jesus" (Matth. i. 21).

The error thus made seems to have been carried over by the poet from the Antiphonary, for we find the following versicle in the Office of the Vigil of the Nativity in Hartker's Antiphonary:[3]

> Nascitur mundo oriens gabrihel quem angelus vocavit emmanuhel nobiscum deus.

[1] Antiphonary of Hartker, p. 49.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[3] P. 8.

This instance, though an isolated one, tends to show that Cynewulf relied not so much upon a direct knowledge of the Holy Scriptures as upon the information he had acquired through his attendance at the Divine Office. For the versicle in question was probably chanted as written, and the error may have been copied time and again unnoticed. The MS. of St. Gall shows no trace of a later erasure and correction, and the neums placed over the word "angelus" are plainly composed for that word. It is most likely that Cynewulf himself never saw this versicle in the written codex, but heard it repeatedly from the lips of the chanters. At any rate, this strange coincidence seems to strengthen the theory of a greater influence of the Antiphonary in the composition of *Christ I* than is being granted by students of the *Christ*.

To line 138.—The introduction of Melchisedech as a prototype of Christ is current in the liturgy of the Church. Yet, the Advent Office contains the same reference to Melchisedech in a Response sung in the week preceding Christmas: [4]

> Praecursor pro nobis ingreditur agnus sine macula secundum ordinem Melchisedech Pontifex factus in aeternum et in saeculum saeculi.

To lines 145 ff.—The motive drawn from the Harrowing of Hell may have been partly suggested by the Response in the Office of the Vigil of Christmas: [5]

> Constantes estote, videbitis auxilium Domini super vos; Iudaea et Hierusalem, nolite timere, cras egrediemini et Dominus erit vobiscum. V. Vos qui in pulvere estis, expergiscimini, et laudate ecce Dominus veniet cum salute.[6]

To lines 306 ff.—In reference to the "golden gate" the Response in the Office of the week proceding Christmas may be noted: [7]

---

[4] Antiphonary of Hartker, p. 35.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[6] For the motive drawn from the Harrowing of Hell see also *Sermo III* attributed to St. Augustine (Migne, P. L., 47, 1153 ff.), in which the "captive souls" in Limbo address Christ. Possibly an influence can also be sought in the remarkable hymn by Bede, "De Passione sancti Joannis Baptistae," (Migne, P. L., 94, 630 f.), in which St. John the Baptist, after his own death, is described as announcing the advent of the Redeemer to the just souls in Limbo, even as he had announced His coming to the living while on earth. In this hymn, moreover, the departed among whom John has come, address him and Christ. To the Redeemer they exclaim: "Descende, Jesu, et eripe."

[7] The Antiphonary of Hartker, p. 36.

> Adnuntiatum est per gabrihelem archangelum mariae virgini de introitu regis et ingressus est per splendidam regionem aurem virginis visitare palatium uteri et egressus est per auream portam virginis.

From the few instances shown here it is apparent that Cynewulf was influenced by the Antiphonary not only in his selection of the O-Antiphons as the themes upon which his paraphrases are built, but also for some of his subsidiary or "interpolated" matter. Nevertheless, the principal dependence of the poet upon the Antiphonary will remain restricted to the general sources for the smaller sections of *Christ I* and to the order of succession in which these follow in the poem. But the Antiphonary thus relied upon by Cynewulf must be interpreted in the light of its actual use in the Divine Office, for the sequence of themes in *Christ I* shows that the poet took not the "written" but the "chanted" sources as a basis for his poem. The one great source of *Christ I,* I believe, is the Divine Office as celebrated in the Advent season. Though it would not be an easy matter to show in what degree even the "interpolated" matter of the poem is taken from the Divine Office for the lack of existing Lectionaries and Homiliaries dating from the time of Cynewulf, still the knowledge we now have of *Christ I* creates a strong presumption in favor of such a theory.

3. Corollary "B"

The Working Methods of Cynewulf and the Unity of the Christ

It would naturally be expected that the methods which Cynewulf is seen to follow in the composition of Part I of the *Christ* should throw some light upon Parts II and III in their relation to the first part. In other words, should not the theory as to the manner in which the poet uses his sources in *Christ I* lead to some conclusion regarding the authorship of this poem as compared with the authorship of Parts II and III? Surely, it will be said, the definite working method of the poet apparent in Part I should be reflected in the other two parts, if these are by the same author. If the method in Part I is different from that of Parts II and III, should this not speak against the common authorship of the three parts and against the unity of the *Christ?*

Yet, it is doubtful if the peculiar method of following the sources in *Christ I* can be made to argue either for or against

the common authorship of the three parts, for the difference of sources as well as of the general theme in the three parts of the *Christ* will always stand in the way of a definite conclusion in this matter.

In defining the sources for Parts II and III of the *Christ*, Cook [8] gives as the primary source of Part II the Ascension sermon of Pope Gregory the Great, and as the secondary source the Ascension hymn attributed to Bede. For Part III he establishes the chief source in the Alphabetical Hymn quoted by Bede in his *De Arte Metrica*. The other influences in this part he determines as follows:

> * * * for the suggestion of the Sign of the Son of Man to the vision of Constantine, a passage in Ephraem Syrus, or one doubtfully attributed to Augustine; for the mourning of the universe at Christ's death, to Gregory; for the bloody sap of the trees, to the Apocrypha; for Christ's address to the sinner, to Caesarius of Arles, or, more ultimately, Ephraem Syrus; for the sword of victory in the hand of the Judge, to Prudentius; and for the account of the joys of the blessed, to Gregory and Augustine.

In this comparative unity of sources in the *Christ*, Cook [9] finds an argument for the unity of the poem. He says:

> The sources of I are from the Breviary; so, too, is Gregory's homily, the most important source of II, and perhaps also the Ascension hymn, or at least part of it, since, as it is found in the *Surtees Hymns*, it may have existed in the Breviary of the period.
> The secondary source of II is a hymn ascribed to Bede; the chief source of III is a hymn first quoted by Bede.
> Not only is Gregory the author of the principal source of II, but he furnishes important subsidiary sources for III.

The sources of the *Christ*, it is true, appear to be derived almost uniformly from the "Breviary," the only exception being the Alphabetical Hymn quoted by Bede, for we have no assurance that this hymn or any part of it was ever used in the Divine Office, (and possibly also the Ascension hymn in Part II). But the term "Breviary," as denoting the depository of these sources is, I believe, somewhat misapplied. In the days of Cynewulf the various portions constituting the Divine Office of the Church had not as yet been collected into one single book.

[8] Pp. xliii-xlv.
[9] P. xxii.

Among the books bequeathed by Bishop Leofric to the cathedral of Exeter (and the "mycel Englisc boc" containing the *Christ* was among them) we find mention of the mass-book, collectaneum, epistle-book, antiphonary, "ad te levavi," troper, psalter, hymnar, blessing-book, martyrology, lectionary, and Gospel-book.[10] All of those books here mentioned which were used in the celebration of the Divine Office would now be collected into the one service-book called the "Breviary." If thus in the days of Cynewulf the various parts to be chanted or recited in the Office were scattered in various codices, the sources of the *Christ* would be more appropriately designated as derived from the "celebration of the Divine Office."

With this distinction of the various service-books in mind, it will be observed that the sources of the *Christ,* while in general derived from the common liturgical celebration of the Divine Office, are yet different in their immediate source-books embodying the various parts of that Office. Thus the sources of Part I of the *Christ* are taken principally from the Antiphonary, while those of Parts II and III are derived from the lectionaries, homiliaries, and hymnars. In Part I the poet bases his paraphrases upon sources that were "chanted" in the Office; in Parts II and III he follows to a great extent sermons that were merely "recited" or read in an elevated tone. In Part I, moreover, the sources appear as individually separate smaller pieces, while those of the other two parts represent a continued theme.

In attempting a comparison of the working methods pursued by the poet in the three parts of the *Christ,* the differences in the sources must necessarily be taken into consideration. The sources derived from the Antiphonary may have influenced Cynewulf in a greater degree than the sources derived from lectionaries. He may himself have been one of the chanters, and as such derived a fuller inspiration from the majestic and sweet music of the O's than from the sermon of a Father. On the other hand, if he was not a chanter, his devout attention during the singing of the Antiphons filled his mind with pious and fervent reflections which themselves clamored for utterance in a song of praise. At any rate, we can well imagine that the influence of chanted Antiphons was different from that conveyed by recited

[10] Cf. Kemble, *Cod. Dipl. Anglo-Sax.,* iv. 275; Daniel Rock, *Church of our Fathers,* ed. Hart and Frere, 1904, iv. 18.

homilies and sermons. As to the arrangement of the O-paraphrases in the poem, he would take them in the order in which the Antiphons upon which they are based were chanted in the Office, for the Greater Antiphons of Advent were taken on certain days and were distributed over the last week of Advent.

The working methods of the poet in Parts II and III of the *Christ* had to adapt themselves to the peculiarity of the sources employed there. The source-books for these parts, the lectionaries, homiliaries, and hymnars were certainly more easily accessible than the antiphonary and thus lent themselves more readily to private study and to the labor of collecting as well as selecting suitable material. For the books containing the sermons and writings of the Fathers were not confined to their use in the Office; they were read and studied by the monk in his cell. They were to be had from the library of the monastery, while the single copy of the Antiphonary remained in the church. Moreover, a sermon or hymn is one complete composition presenting a continued theme, while the O-Antiphons are detached pieces individually celebrating one of the Scriptural titles given to the coming Redeemer. These Antiphons are spread over a whole week in the Divine Office, while the sermons and homilies of the Fathers as well as the hymns were read or sung, in their largest portion at least, at one time. In the readings of the Office there was no specified number of lines or pages; the reader continued until the sign for terminating the selection was given by the Superior. In the sources for Parts II and III of the *Christ*, therefore, the order in which they appear in the Office does not affect the working methods of the poet in the same degree as the order of succession in the O-Antiphons. When paraphrasing the Greater Antiphons, the poet had to deal with sources that came in a certain sequence; when paraphrasing or utilizing a sermon or hymn, he had this before him in its entirety without successive parts.

If the smaller divisions of Part I in themselves are considered, the poet's method does not materially differ in the three parts of the *Christ*. Wherefore, the chief contrast between the working methods pursued in Part I and those followed in Parts II and III lies in the arrangement of material, and this contrast was seen to flow from the nature of the sources employed. Consequently the question of the unity of the *Christ* does not

appear to be materially affected by the result of my study as to the construction of *Christ I.* The real difficulty in accepting a common authorship of the three parts of the Christ seems to lie in the difference of the sources themselves. If the author of Part I selects a series of Antiphons as the basis of his poem, why does the author of Part II not also base his poem upon the Antiphons of the Ascension Office? Again, if the poet takes the Gospel narrative with homilies and sermons written upon it as the basis for Parts II and III, why does he not follow the Gospel narrative with corresponding homiletical expansions in his treatment of the Advent of Christ in the Incarnation? This difficulty, of course, is mitigated by the fact that the Divine Office which celebrates the Ascension and the Doomsday does not contain such an admirable set of Antiphons embodying the pith and marrow of the theme as does the Advent Office.

While the unity of the *Christ* has as yet not been established to the satisfaction of all inquirers, the presumptions in favor of it do not seem to be lessened by the working methods of the poet apparent in his construction of Part I of the poem.

4. Corollary "C"

The Sources of the Christ and the Poet

In the study presented above it was seen that the poet's dependence upon the Antiphonary extends to the arrangement of the smaller divisions of *Christ I* in the successive order which the sources hold in the actual use of the Antiphonary at the Divine Office. Cynewulf is thus conceived as deriving his inspiration and material for Part I of the *Christ* not so much from a copy of the Antiphonary before him, as from a "living" Antiphonary in actual use in the Church service. The construction of *Christ I* therefore points to the poet's personal attendance at the Divine Office. This then becomes the well of inspiration for him in the composition of his poem. The sources of Parts II and III of the *Christ* likewise show the poet's dependence upon the Divine Office for the inspiration and material which gave rise to his poetical version of the Ascension and the Doomsday. Although we are left largely to our own surmises in regard to the actual content of the various lectionaries, homiliaries, hymnars, and other Office-books at the time of Cynewulf, there can be no

doubt of the dependence of the poet, even in Parts II and III of the *Christ,* upon the sources available in the celebration of the Divine Office.

In making an investigation of the sources of the *Christ,* it would therefore seem but natural to seek those sources in the first instance in the Divine Office, which furnishes the principal material of the poem. And when a particular source has been discovered, say a homily of one of the Fathers, it should, according to our present knowledge of the *Christ,* be brought into relation with the Divine Office of Cynewulf's time whenever possible. For a study of the *Christ* tends to show that the one great source upon which the poet relied was the Divine Office of the Church, and our investigations are likely to yield more immediate and direct results if this fact is borne in mind.

Yet the practice followed by some students of the *Christ* appears to be a different one. They seem to proceed in their task of investigation from the supposition that Cynewulf knew and used all the Christian writings extant in his day, but that his knowledge of the Divine Office with all it contained was negligible. Consequently, in their quest for sources and influences, they roam far and wide over all the domains of literature, with little or no attention to the one great source with which the poet shows the most intimate familiarity, the Office of the Church.

Allen W. Porterfield [11] has once remarked that "the ultimate determining of sources is an ungrateful theme," because, in the last analysis, it is hard to say just "who copied from whom." This remark appears to strike home in the case of Cynewulf. The fact that he is removed by so many centuries from our day makes it difficult, indeed, to determine in each case the particular source which should have influenced him in the composition of his poems. Wherefore it appears all the more necessary to reduce as far as possible the various influences surrounding the poet to one comprehensive medium, and that medium is the Divine Office. If, for instance, a thought is detected in the *Christ* which reflects a similar thought expressed by St. Gregory in his *Moralia,* does that make Cynewulf at once familiar with all the writings of Gregory or even with the entire book in question? Did this thought perhaps not appear time and again

[11] "Graf von Loeben and the Legend of the Lorelei," in *Modern Philology,* xiii, 326, note 2.

in the readings of the Divine Office?[12] Thus it happens that Cynewulf is credited with an erudition which he perhaps never acquired even in his old age when he found the "power of song released from his breast" (*Elene,* line 1251).

In presenting a full and helpful edition of Cynewulf's writings, it is no doubt profitable to trace the thoughts expressed by the poet to their ultimate source, and to illustrate a theological doctrine or opinion by references from other authors. Still, it would appear even more helpful to a student, if the proper distinction were carefully made between mere references for the sake of enlightenment and excerpts that are considered as sources influencing the mind of the poet. Unfortunately, the task of satisfactorily annotating the text of the *Christ* seems to have led Cook slightly astray in his endeavor to do full justice to the content as well as the religious spirit of the poem. For we find in his edition of the *Christ* an accumulation of material which cannot always serve as a positive help to inquiring minds. In saying this there is, of course, no desire to underestimate the value of the scholarly work embodied by Cook in his Notes, nor even to hint at the idea that such methods do not serve a useful purpose of dispelling the dense clouds of earlier misconceptions and consequent erroneous deductions that have hitherto obscured the full grandeur and majesty of this early luminary in the sky of our native religious poetry.

Yet, frankly, we cannot entirely rid ourselves of the opinion that such an elaborate apparatus as appears from the copiousness of the Notes in question has the tendency to conceal some real problems still confronting us, and to blur the true picture which our mind should be forming of the poet himself. It is no wonder that the impression is gained that Cynewulf was rather a savant than a humble and fervent poet. Cook[13] ascribes to him a "mastery of patristic, hymnic, and liturgical literature," and adds, "his reading was so extensive, and, what is more to the purpose, so perfectly assimilated, that it is inconceivable that he should have been ignorant of letters until late in life." At another place

[12] It is quite common to hear a modern preacher proclaim: "St. Bernard said this and this * * *," when we know from personal acquaintance that the preacher in question is by no means a student of the works of Bernard, but has acquired his information solely from the reading of the Office.

[13] P. lxxxii.

Cook [14] says of Cynewulf: "He was a zealous student of the Bible; of the poetry or poetical prose of Bede, Gregory the Great, Jerome, Augustine, Prudentius, Caesarius of Arles, and Alcuin; of the creeds, the antiphons, and the hymns of the church. So familiar does he become with Latin that words from that language slip unobserved, as it were, into his lines."

It cannot be denied that all the influences mentioned above are detected in the *Christ,* but that does not necessarily stamp Cynewulf as a "zealous student" of all the sources employed. The study of the *Christ,* indeed, reveals the truth of the poet's own autobiographical note in which he says, *ic * * * wundrum læs;* [15] yet the field of knowledge from which he gathered so wondrously need not be unnecessarily extended. From the nature of the sources in the *Christ,* this field could even be limited to the information which the poet gained in his attendance at the Divine Office. If he was a monk, an additional medium of information may have been furnished by the readings conducted in the monastery.

But can Cynewulf be conceived as having embraced the monastic calling? Cook says: [16] "Whether or not he became a monk we have no means of knowing; but we do know that the monastic life was the natural resort of the elect souls of that age, and that the Antiphons which he loved bear traces of monastic influence." In the study of the O-Antiphons above, it was seen that at least three of the Antiphons which Cynewulf paraphrased in *Christ I,* the *O Hierusalem,* the *O Rex Pacifice,* and the *O mundi Domina,* are found only in the monastic Antiphonary. It appears that the suggestion of Cook is strong evidence of Cynewulf's monastic life.

Cynewulf himself has left us some autobiographical data, but these have been interpreted in more than one meaning. They are contained in the closing lines of his *Elene* (lines 1237-1277),[17] and might throw some light upon the subject under discussion.

Apparently the words of Cynewulf in these lines have created the widespread impression of the poet's conversion from paganism to Christianity towards the close of his life. In the first

[14] P. lxxxix.
[15] *Elene,* line 1238.
[16] P. xcvi.
[17] *The Elene,* C. W. Kent. Boston, 1889. We quote from this edition.

place, the poet nowhere gives an intimation justifying such a conclusion. He indeed says:

* * * ic wæs weorcum fāh,
synnum āsæled, sorgum gewæled,
bitrum gebunden, bisgum beþrungen,
ær mē lāre onlāg þurh lēohtne hād
gamelum tō gēoce * * * (lines 1243ᵇ-1247ᵃ)

but he nowhere speaks of previous infidelity. The anxieties, the bitterness and the tribulations which he experienced are set down as the consequences of his misdeeds and sins. Though the *lēoht hād* could be interpreted as the grace of holy baptism in which he received *gife unscynde* (line 1247), and in which the *mægencyning*

bāncofan onband, brēostlocan onwand, (line 1250)

still he says expressly concerning the holy rood:

* * * Nysse ic gearwe
be ðære (rōde) riht, ær mē rūmran geþeaht
þurh ðā mæran miht on mōdes þeaht,
wīsdōm, onwrāh. (lines 1240ᵇ-1243ᵃ)

This seems to imply that the poet already possessed some knowledge of the Cross before "wisdom revealed a larger view into the cogitation of my heart," which would hardly have been the case had he been reared in paganism.

The wisdom of which the poet speaks here seems to coincide with the *lāre * * * þurh lēohtne hād* of line 1246. The *lēoht hād* itself might be applied to the monastic profession, which was, in its effect, considered a new baptism. That it should bring illumination to the mind and soul of the newly professed is expressed in the words and ceremonies of the act of profession, as carried out in some Benedictine monasteries even today. After the vows have been pronounced by the candidate, he prostrates himself upon the floor of the sanctuary, is covered with a pall and surrounded by six lighted candles, while the choir chants the *Miserere* and the bell is tolled. This ceremony indicates the new monk's death to the secular life. His rising to a new life of religion is then symbolized by the removing of the tapers and the pall, and by the chanting of the words: *Surge qui dormis, et exsurge a mortuis, et illuminabit te Christus.*[18] From the death-

[18] For a transcript of the ceremonies accompanying the act of profession I am indebted to the members of the novitiate in New Subiaco Abbey (Ark.).

sleep of sin and worldly vanities the newly professed monk awakens to a new day of grace and spiritual life, and the light of that day is Christ. In this new light a new vista of religious knowledge and experience opens before the mind and soul of the monk, and the experiences of which Cynewulf speaks in the closing lines of the *Elene* might all be referred to this change which came over him after he had embraced the monastic life.

While the words of Cynewulf therefore cannot be safely interpreted as implying a conversion from paganism to Christianity, they seem to find an application to the conversion from the secular to the religious or monastic life.

It is well known to students of monachism that the entrance into a monastic order is considered a conversion.[19] It is a conversion, not of faith or doctrinal belief, but of morals, a *conversio morum.* When pronouncing their monastic vows, the Benedictine monks explicitly add to the three customary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, a vow of stability in the order and a vow of the conversion of their morals, as prescribed by the Rule of St. Benedict. The holy founder of that Order directs as follows:[20] *Suscipiendus autem in Oratorio coram omnibus promittat de stabilitate sua, et conversione morum suorum, et obedientia, coram Deo et Sanctis ejus.*[21]

If Cynewulf was a monk, and many facts seem to point to this conclusion, the sources upon which he could draw were not confined to the chanting and reciting of the Divine Office with its rich Biblical, patristic, hagiographic and liturgical content, but they included also the wide and extensive readings which were conducted in the monastery outside the Divine Office itself.

In his Rule,[22] St. Benedict devotes much attention to the reading of the monks. He prescribes it at table and enjoins deep silence at the meals in order to stimulate the attention of the hearers. He sets aside a certain portion of the day for private reading and study, especially after the meals, after the perform-

[19] Cf. *Thesaurus linguae latinae,* iv. 855 ff.

[20] *Rule of St. Benedict,* ed. Hunter-Blair, cap. lviii. p. 154.

[21] For a full discussion of the *conversio morum* see Matthäus Rothenhäusler, "Zur Aufnahmeordnung der Regula S. Benedicti"; and Ildefons Herwegen, "Geschichte der Benediktinischen Professformel," both published in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens,* Münster, 1912. Heft 3.

[22] Cf. chapters xxxviii, xlii, xlviii.

ance of the manual labors of the day, and before the Compline service. The material of which the reading is to consist is not specified minutely, this being largely dependent upon the books and codices at hand, yet he mentions in particular "the Conferences (of Cassian), the lives of the Fathers, or something else which may edify the hearers."

Cynewulf may have been a Northumbrian, he may have been a Mercian; it is possible that he graced the episcopal throne of Winchester or Lindisfarne, it is again possible that he attached his signature as a simple priest to a decree enacted at the Synod of Clovesho (803): not one of these suppositions has been established to the satisfaction of all inquirers, and perhaps will never be so established.

Yet, from the nature of his works which he has bequeathed to us, and from the incidents which he himself recorded of his life and religious experience, the inference that he was a monk is not to be dismissed as untenable. In striving to estimate as nearly as possible in our day the influences which must have borne upon Cynewulf, the probability of his monastic profession, I believe, should be given its due share of consideration.

Wherefore, the influences surrounding our poet should be read from his life and position rather than read into them. The sources upon which Cynewulf relied in the first instance are those with which his daily life brought him into the closest contact: the Divine Office embracing the liturgical content of the Antiphonary, of the homiliaries and lectionaries, of the hymnars and psalters; the readings of the monastery extending to the lives of the Saints, the writings of the Fathers, and also the classical writers and poets. That he must have been a deep student of all or any of these, is not a necessary conclusion. He himself tells us that he "gathered wondrously," but the gathering was done within his own calling and station in life. Yet, what he gathered was made the object of deep personal reflection, and in our day constitutes the study and delight of all lovers of Old English Christian Poetry.

5. Conclusion

The conclusion at which we have arrived in the study here presented is that the position taken by scholars in regard to the arrangement of the material in *Christ I* needs modification. Cer-

tainly, the theory that Cynewulf threw the twelve divisions of the poem together at random seems untenable in view of the close dependence, which he is seen to disclose in the poem, upon the Antiphonary in the succession of his paraphrases. Cynewulf does appear to have bestowed some attention upon the "architectonics," the "perspective" of his poem, for the sources upon which he based the various sections of *Christ I* give to the poem not merely a lyrical unity, or a unity of mood secured through the character of the Advent season, but also a unity of structure.

Indeed, *Christ I* is not a narrative poem and cannot therefore be expected to present a well developed plot with its beginning, middle, and end. It stands apart from the usual literary composition because of the unusual character of its sources. But in following his sources the poet was faithful to the outline or plan which these themselves offered. If taken in their actual Church use, the sources of *Christ I* not only furnish the material for the poetic version of the Advent of Christ, but also give this version of the Advent theme a unity and completeness which would seem to destroy the charge that Cynewulf was "a poet indeed, but a poet untrained in composition."

This faithful adherence to the sources is not only what we would expect from an Old English poet like Cynewulf, but in the light of a better understanding both of *Christ I* and of its sources in the Church use of the time, it seems a conclusion worthy of some consideration.

V

BIBLIOGRAPHY [1]

AMALARIUS, *De Ordine Antiphonarii* (Migne, P. L., vol. 105).

ANTIPHONAIRE MONASTIQUE (XII[e] siècle) : Codex 601 de la Bibliothèque Capitulaire de Lucques (et Codex 48.18 de la Cathédrale de Tolède), in *Paléographie Musicale,* vol. ix Tournai, 1906.

ANTIPHONALE OFFICII MONASTICI, écrit par le B. HARTKER: Codex No. 390-391 de la Bibliothèque de Saint-Gall, in *Paléographie Musicale,* ii series, vol. i. Solesmes, 1900.

BINTERIM, ANTON JOSEPH, *Die vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche aus den ersten, mittlern, und letzten Zeiten.* Mainz, 1829, vol. v.

BLUME, CLEMENS, *Hymnody* (Catholic Encyclopædia, vii. 595).

BRANDL, ALOIS, *Englische Literatur* (in Paul's *Grundriss,* II[1]. 1035 ff.).

BREUIARIUM ABERDONENSE, ed. W. Blew, The Maitland Club (No. 70), London, 1854, vol. ii. (This is the Aberdeen Breviary of 1508.)

BREVIARIUM AD USUM SARUM, ed. Proctor and Wordsworth, Cambridge, 1879-1886.

BREVIARIUM PARISIENSE, anno 1736. Paris. pars hiemalis.

BROOKE, STOPFORD A., *The History of Early English Literature.* New York, 1892.

CABROL, DOM F., "L'Avent Liturgique," in *Revue Bénédictine,* xxii. 484 ff.

COOK, A. S., *The Christ of Cynewulf.* Boston, 1900 (second impression, 1909).

"A Remote Analogue to the Miracle Play," in *Journal of Germanic Philology,* iv. 421-451.

"A Dramatic Tendency in the Fathers," in *Journal of Germanic Philology,* v. 62-64.

DUFFIELD, S. W., *The Latin Hymn-Writers and their Hymns,* ed. Prof. R. E. Thompson. New York, 1889.

GRANCOLAS, J., *Commentarius Historicus in Romanum Breviarium,* Venice. 1734.

GREEN, EVERARD, "On the Words O SAPIENTIA in the Kalendar," in *Archæologia,* vol. xlix, part i. 219-241.

GREGORY, ST., THE GREAT, *Liber Responsalis sive Antiphonarius* (Migne, P. L., vol. 78).

Liber Sacramentorum (Migne, P. L., vol. 78).

GUÉRANGER, D. PROSPER, *The Liturgical Year: Advent.* Translated by Rev. Dom Laurence Shepherd. Dublin, 1883.

HUNTER-BLAIR, D. OSWALD, *The Rule of St. Benedict.* Fort-Augustus, 1906.

[1] The Bibliography is limited to those works which have been used in the preparation of this study.

HONORIUS OF AUTUN, *Gemma Animae* (Migne, P. L., vol. 172).

JOANNES ROTHOMAGENSIS, *Fragmenta Quaedam* (Migne, P. L., vol. 147). *Ordinarium* (Migne, P. L., vol. 147).

KENT, C. W., *Cynewulf's Elene.* Boston, 1889.

LEOFRIC COLLECTAR: Harl. MS. 2961, ed. by E. S. Dewick. The Henry Bradshaw Society (vol. 45). London, 1914.

MARTÈNE, EDMUND, *De Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus.* Lyons, 1706. lib. ii.

MASKELL, WILLIAM, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae.* London, 1846. vol. ii.

MAXIMUS, *Homilia II* (Migne, P. L., vol. 57).

MAY, ALFRED A., "A Source for *Christ,* ll. 348-377," in *Modern Language Notes,* xxiv. 158 f.

MONE, F. J., *Lateinische Hymen des Mittelalters.* Freiburg-i-Br. 1853. vol. i.

MOORE, SAMUEL, "The Source of *Christ* 416 ff.," in *Modern Language Notes,* xxix, 226 f.

NEALE, J. M., *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History.* London, 1863.

PAMELIUS, IACOBUS, *Liturgica Latinorum.* Coloniae Agrippinae. 1571. vol. i.

PAULUS DIACONUS, *Homiliarius* (Migne, P. L., vol. 95).

SMITHSON, GEORGE ARNOLD, *The Old English Christian Epic.* University of California Publications in Modern Philology, i. No. 4. Berkeley, 1910.

TERTULLIAN, *Liber Apologeticus adversus Gentes* (Migne, P. L., vol. 1). *Liber III adversus Marcionem* (Migne, P. L., vol. 2).

THURSTON, HERBERT, "The Great Antiphons: Heralds of Christmas," in *The Month.* London. vol. 106.

TOMMASI, *Opera Omnia,* ed. A. F. Vezzosi. Rome, 1749, vol. iv.

WHITMAN, C. H., *The Christ of Cynewulf.* A Translation. Boston, 1900.

WULKER, RICHARD PAUL, "Dramatische Bestrebungen der Angelsachsen," in his *Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Literatur.* Leipzig, 1885.

YORK BREVIARY, ed. Lawley. vol. ii.

VITA

The writer of this dissertation, Edward Burgert, was born in Paris, Arkansas, on October 15, 1887. He attended the parochial school in Morrison's Bluff and Little Rock, Arkansas, and subsequently Subiaco College, Subiaco, Arkansas, where he completed the high school, college and seminary courses, and, in 1905, received the degree of Bachelor of Arts. He entered the Order of St. Benedict in the fall of 1906, and was ordained to the priesthood on June 24, 1911. For seven years he was instructor in Subiaco College. After attending, in 1918, the First Summer Session of Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Indiana, he spent three years, from 1918 to 1921, in the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., where he followed courses in English under Drs. P. J. Lennox and F. J. Hemelt, in Germanic Philology under Dr. Paul Gleis, in General Linguistics under Rev. James A. Geary, and in Mediæval Institutions under Dr. Paschal Robinson, O. F. M.

PAMPHLET BINDER
PAT. NO.
877188
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

Date Due

~~FACULTY~~

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

PR1645 .B95
The dependence of part I of Cynewulf's
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00028 0661